DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 342 HE 011 646

TITLE Education for Justice. Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education. Volume V, Number 1. Summer 1979.
INSTITUTION Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 38p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 770, Washington, D.C. 20036

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catholic Educators; Christianity; *Church Related Colleges; *Church Role; College Administration; College Planning; *College Role; Educational Economics; Educational Quality; Governance; Higher Education; Humanism; Humanities; Liberal Arts; Political Influences; *Private Colleges; Religious Education; Social Problems; Theological Education
IDENTIFIERS Saint Johns University MN

ABSTRACT

The role of Catholicism in American higher education is addressed in this collection of papers. The historical tradition of the Catholic university is discussed as well as the problems they must face. Issues examined include: political and financial concerns of church-related colleges and universities, the role of the university in higher education, and the role of the Catholic colleges and universities. The governance of Catholic institutions, their relationship to the church hierarchy, and planning for the future are also considered. Included are: Toward a True University, Truly Catholic (Edmund D. Pellegrino); Toward a Theology of Learning (Thomas Trotter); The University and Change in the Catholic World (Sargent Shriver); Homily for a Baccalaureate Ceremony (John Tracy Ellis); The Catholic College: A Question of Identity (Xavier G. Colavechio); The Emerging Guardianship of American Catholic Higher Education (Martin J. Stamm); Institutional Vitality, Up Against the Eighties (James A. Ebben); and The NEH Christian Humanism Project at Saint John's Collegeville (R. W. Franklin). (SF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175342

EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

OCCASIONAL PAPERS On Catholic Higher Education

Invocation for the ACCU Annual Meeting ..... Inside Front Cover
Irene Woodward, SNJM

Preface 1
Alice Gallin, OSU

Toward a True University, Truly Catholic 3
Edmund D. Pellegrino, M.D.

Toward a Theology of Learning 8
Thomas Trotter

The University and Change in the Catholic World 12
Sargent Shriver

Homily for a Baccalaureate Ceremony 16
John Tracy Ellis

The Catholic College: A Question of Identity 20
Xavier G. Colavechio, O. Praem.

The Emerging Guardianship of American Catholic Higher Education 25
Martin J. Stamm

Institutional Vitality, Up Against the Eighties 30
James A. Ebben

The NEH Christian Humanism Project at Saint John's Collegeville 33
R. W. Franklin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Volume V, Number 1
Summer 1979

ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HE 011 644

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INVOCATION AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF ACCU, FEBRUARY 1979

Irene Woodward, SNJM

O God and Father of us all, we come together as a people who have heard your word through Jesus, your Son and our Brother, and as people whose joy is in seeking to plumb the meaning of that word by sharing it with others through the ministry of higher education.

Father, we cherish this message and we hold in esteem all of the peoples of this planet whom you have created. Come to us in a special way in these days of our re-commitment to our ministries. We embark on a newer task to learn how best, at this time, to participate in our history in the life of the *polis,* to insert ourselves into the public life as a leaven, not demeaning that society by which we are nurtured, but by enlivening it.

We are tempted either to the arrogance which puts us above the city of man or to the privacy which shuts us off from the world.

Help us therefore, Lord, to be stewards in the spirit of your Son. Help us as we seek to do your will by granting us the humility which gentles our arrogance, the courage which drives us beyond our privacy, and the respect for the works of human endeavor which enables us to love and act as your people.

PREFACE

Of all our perennial questions, the most enduring one seems to be: "What makes a college or university Catholic?" In previous issues of *Occasional Papers* we have proposed possible answers in a variety of ways. We have dealt with Campus Ministry (Winter '76), the Ministry of Faculty as they are engaged in their particular disciplines (Winter '77, Summer '78), and we have described efforts at making Education for Justice central to our institutions (Winter '78). Theology programs have been analyzed (Winter, Summer '75); Teacher Education examined (Summer '77). Naturally, the question continues to stand before us to challenge our reflections and our decisions.

In this issue we pull together some further reflections on the topic. These were not prepared around a theme for the specific purposes of *Occasional Papers;* they were, rather, selected from many presentations heard or read over the past few years because they seem to push the parameters a bit further and expand our vision of what a Catholic college or university might look like.

It is particularly timely to engage in such reflection as we prepare for a first in American Higher education—the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities to be held at the University of Notre Dame June 21-23. True ecumenical dialogue presupposes some clarity about denominational tradition. Twenty-two different Christian denominations are sponsoring this Congress in the hope that it will renew and revitalize church-related education. Study Commissions are already preparing position papers on a range of topics: educational purpose and programs, the church-related college and public policies, legal issues, finances, the church-related college confronting social issues, forms of relationship between church and college. We hope to be able to bring some of them to you in *Occasional Papers.*

Of the many institutions that might be designated church-related, the university has its own role to play, its own peculiar identity to develop. How shall we describe it? All can agree, no doubt, that cultivation of the things of the mind is basic to the growth of the human spirit and therefore fundamental to human life. In *Gaudium et Spes,* the Second Vatican Council emphasized the unique contribution of culture:

> *It is a fact bearing on the very person of man that he can come to an authentic and full humanity only through culture, that is through the cultivation of natural goods and values . . . The word "culture" in its general sense indicates all those factors by which man refines and unfolds his manifold spiritual and bodily qualities. It means his effort to bring the world itself under his control by his knowledge and his labor . . . finally, it is a feature of culture that throughout the course of time man expresses, communicates, and conserves in his works great spiritual experiences and desires, so that these may be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family.*

The whole section on culture and its relation to human activity and faith is well worth reading and re-reading by those who seek to understand the mission of the Catholic university. Simultaneously broadening our concept of "education" in the modern world and specifying the role of the different academic disciplines in the search for truth, goodness and beauty, the Council urges us to deal with the inevitable tensions present in contemporary cultural pluralism. The questions raised might well be considered by our administrators and faculties as an agenda for the '80's:

> *What must be done to prevent the increased exchanges between cultures, which ought to lead to a true and fruitful dialogue between groups and nations, from disturbing the life of communities, destroying ancestral wisdom, or jeopardizing the uniqueness of each people?*
>
> *How can the vitality and growth of a new culture be fostered without the loss of living fidelity to the heritage of tradition? The question is especially urgent when a culture resulting from the enormous scientific and technological pro-*

gress must be harmonized with an education nourished by classical studies as adapted to various traditions.

As special branches of knowledge continue to shoot out so rapidly, how can the necessary synthesis of them be worked out, and how can men preserve the ability to contemplate and to wonder, from which wisdom comes?

What can be done to make all men on earth share in cultural values when the culture of the more sophisticated grows ever more refined and complex?

Finally, how is the independence which culture claims for itself to be recognized as legitimate without the promotion of a humanism which is merely earth-bound, and even contrary to religion itseif? (Gaudum et Spes, *para. 57)*

Confrontation of these questions—each of which requires profound study—will be furthered by participation in several events in the next two years: the National Congress on Church-Related Colleges and Universities already mentioned, the International Federation of Catholic Universities meeting at Louvain-la-Neuve in 1980 on the topic "The Catholic University Confronting the Ethical Problems of the Technological Society," and the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology scheduled for Vienna in 1980. The Hastings Center in its many seminars and publications on Ethical Values will also provide stimulation for our thinking and our discussion. In all, the moment seems ripe for a revitalization of the very heart of the University, its academic program. The call to Christian scholarship and Christian teaching, far from being muted by the societal changes all around us, is only clarified and strengthened. The articles contained in this issue of *Occasional Papers* will provide, we hope, additional grist for the mill.

Alice Gallin, OSU
Associate Executive Director

TOWARD A TRUE UNIVERSITY, TRULY CATHOLIC

Inaugural Address—March 30, 1979

Edmund D. Pellegrino, M.D.

Institutions survive or fail on the probity of the ideals that inspire them. This exquisitely must be the case with universities whose proper life is in the realm of mind and spirit.

Today our universities seem enervated by the arduous exercise of fiscal and managerial survival. Yet these exigencies must not becloud our vision of what it is we are struggling to save, and for what purposes.

This morning I accepted the medallion symbolic of the authority vested in me for the administration of this university. Obviously I must attend to the same exigencies that bedevil all university presidents. But I am also responsible for sustaining the probity of the ideal that gives meaning to those efforts—the ideal of a true university, truly Catholic. Whatever else I am called upon to do, I am charged to refurbish and re-examine that ideal. It is the benchmark against which all our decisions must be made.

What do we mean by a true university, truly Catholic? The times are propitious for such an inquiry. In twenty years two of Western mankind's most cherished institutions—the university and the Church—will enter new millennia—the Church its third, the university its second. One was born in the bosom of the other. Though their mother-daughter relationship has often been uneasy, their lives have been inextricably tied to each other. In the democratic, pluralistic and man-centered era of today, many wonder whether that union can survive, or even ought to.

A president may safely negotiate all the fiscal reefs and yet fail miserably if his agenda for survival compromises the unique functions the university serves in a civilized society. Survival at the cost of academic authenticity may be worse for society than outright bankruptcy. In the interest of the workable, the popular, the profitable and the relevant, we can bend a university out of all recognizable shape.

In a Catholic university, economic and intellectual reality must be reconciled with the demands of faith and an institutional Church. So difficult is this balance that some have already written off Catholic universities along with religion as the future of an "illusion."[1]

Before we take too hastily to the analyst's couch, we might ponder for a moment whether our illusion has some substance in reality. I believe it does, and that true universities, truly Catholic, are indispensable to the Church, to the world of learning and to the kind of society we profess to be.

I make this assertion confidently because Catholic universities bear a tradition and a future which admirably suit them to heal what is, perhaps, the central intellectual malaise in today's universities. That malaise, though easily beclouded by fiscal and managerial exigencies, is spiritual and intellectual—it is the malaise of value-free learning, of studied moral neutralism, of a defect in equipping students to make value decisions in a morally pluralistic society.

Twenty years ago, Daniel Bell hailed universities as the "prime institutions of post-industrial society."[2] High expectations and unparalleled public support made that prophecy seem unassailable. Suddenly—within less than a decade—Utopia became Armageddon. Universities were almost overwhelmed. The seismology of those academic tremors is still problematic. Two impressions of those days are fixed in my memory: (1) The frustration of students with their own lack of preparation to make moral judgments and (2) their disillusionment with the moral confusion of their teachers. The issues facing society then, as now, were moral issues but they were confronted politically and emotionally. Our failure at genuine moral discourse was itself morally culpable.

Universities survived but the moral malaise continues. We are very much in the position of Abel Sanchez, De Unamuno's hero, who asked:

> *What good our having tasted the fruits of knowledge, good and evil, without* freeing ourselves *of the evil?*[3]

Politics, economics, technology and medicine have enormously expanded our knowledge of the good and evil pos-

sible to man. Our culture has yet to assimilate, sort, and order those possibilities. The university has been slow in preparing students for the constructive criticism of culture a healthy society demands.

Democratic societies cannot survive unless the minds of their citizens are free and informed enough to guide governments and experts in the humane use of human knowledge. Political freedom assures that we are free to express our opinions. But it cannot guarantee that the opinions we express are freely chosen. A liberal education is the surest guarantee of a free society.

A democratic and civilized life, therefore, is impossible without certain skills with respect to the acquisition, use and criticism of human knowledge. An authentic university imparts these skills—but it never exalts one at the expense of the other.

Knowledge without criticism makes for directionless minds and a directionless society, pulled hither and yon by every new technique and every new world view. The citizens of a directionless society easily become the slaves of each other's expertise. Without the capacity to judge critically about values and morals we are the victims of rhetoric and demogoguery. Our most searing national experiences attest to that incapacity—Vietnam, Watergate, the dubious ethics of some public figures, our confusion over energy policies, the uses of medical technology, our whole oscillation between technological pessimism and optimism, even the terrible experience of the People's Temple in Guyana. Where the critical intelligence is weak or inoperative the demonic fills the void.

Alfred North Whitehead was right. The function of a university is "to create the future."[4] Today's present is the future created by the universities of two decades ago—universities excelling in the acquisition and use of knowledge and techniques, but overcommitted to moral neutrality about their use.

We are now a society of experts—physicians, lawyers, engineers, businessmen—each in possession of some partial view of man, each ready to universalize some small parcel of knowledge to fashion the good life or explain human existence. Even the humanists are specialists in a discipline—possessors of a fragment of the cloth of reality, no longer teaching what all educated people should know.

A civilized society is impossible without experts, and universities must continue to train them. But universities also have the responsibility to help us locate ourselves as persons. By "locations" I mean the points at which we stand with reference to the critical issues of our time. Our locations give us identity but only if they are freely chosen as our own and not imposed or borrowed.

To locate ourselves we need two things: a critical intellect and a set of values to test, and be tested by, the claims other minds make on our own. The liberal arts traditionally have freed our minds because they teach us how to define terms, to tell fact from opinion, the proven from the plausible, to discern and challenge arguments, to judge and to tackle new subjects on our own, freeing us even from our teachers. They are the essential tools of all learning.

Every subject can be taught liberally, sciences as well as arts. Each makes some claim about what is good, or true, or beautiful. The sciences, however, excel at acquisition and use of knowledge while the humanities, properly taught, open up the whole range of human values from which we must choose our own. Every philosopher makes claims on our ideas, every writer on our imagination, every artist on our sense of beauty, and every historian on our sense of continuity. The humanities criticize our use of knowledge by criticizing our culture—"that system of ideas by which a period lives,"[5] to use the words of Ortega Y Gasset. "We must," he says further, "return to the university its cardinal function of enlightenment."[6]

"The scholar" is, indeed, as Emerson said, "the delegated intellect. In the right state he becomes a mere thinker or even worse, the parrot of other men's thinking."[7] The university owes a democratic society the assurance that its citizens, too, will not be parrots.

Too much has already been written about today's crisis in the humanities to vex this topic further. Suffice it to say that teaching the humanities only as specialties, confusing scholarship with education, and general education with the liberal arts are the cardinal sins whose penance is that loss of influence on life the humanities suffer today.

To criticize any culture constructively we need the interaction of reason with faith and belief. Criticism without beliefs is mere analysis; beliefs without criticism are merely free assertions, freely deniable. Each alone is lethal for any kind of enlightened life. As the Hasadic saying has it,

> *To attain truth, man must pass forty-nine gates only to arrive finally before the last gate, the last question beyond which he cannot live without faith.*

An act of faith is at the root of every construction we put on reality, secular or religious. The man of religious faith would say with Gilson,

> *What is reason but the rational understanding of faith.*[8]

The man of science would agree with Weiskopf,

> *We believe in the fundamental laws that govern everything in nature.*[9]

What happens when those two faiths seem to converge? The evidence of science now points to a finite cosmos with a beginning in time to the wonder of some and the unbelieving consternation of others. Is one faith to be abandoned for the other—or are they different construction of the same reality?

We are entering an era in which the conjunctions of faith and reason will promise to be more frequent because our knowledge is more fundamental. It is precisely in those

conjunctions that Catholic universities, provided they are true universities and truly Catholic, are indispensable to culture and learning. The Church has always taught that faith leaves reason intact and that their reconciliation is fundamental to its intellectual ministry.

In the earliest days of his pontificate, Pope John Paul II has affirmed the responsibilities of Catholic universities for an apostolate of culture. Their mission, he said:

> *To make a specific contribution to the church and society—thanks to a really complete study of the different problems—with the concern to show the full significance of man regenerated in Christ and thus permit his complete development; to form pedagogically men who, having made a personal synthesis between faith and culture will be capable both of keeping their place in society and of bearing witness in it to their faith; to set up, among teachers and students, a real community which already bears witness visibly to a living Christianity.*[10]

Specifically, the Pope rejects all partial humanisms:

> *In the midst of the swarm of present day approaches, which too often lead, moreover, to a minimizing of man, Christians have an original role to play, within research and teaching, precisely because they reject any partial vision of man.*[11]

In his profound and richly textured first encyclical he delineates the integral humanism which is the foundation of the Church dialogue with all men and their human needs. He expresses special concern for the menace of technology and the need to inform technology with ethics.[12]

It is not difficult to see why an intellectual ministry is crucial to a Church whose mission is to speak to all men and women in the name of a special set of values and beliefs. But why is that ministry so important to secular society and secular universities as well?

For one thing, a university under religious auspices helps man to locate himself in a most important dimension of human experience. No man is educated who has not formed his own opinion about the divine and the transcendental. That opinion should be informed and authentic. It is the responsibility of Catholic universities to preserve, enrich, and examine the set beliefs that constitute Christian Catholic humanism for all who wish to examine it and to see it exemplified.

Universities under other religious persuasions have a similar responsibility to represent their doctrinal tradition and bring it into dialogue with secular value systems. A genuinely pluralistic society needs authentic expressions of the roots of its pluralism. Ezra Pound put it tersely thus, "A man wanting to conserve a tradition would always do well to find out first what it is."[13] This is good advice for believers as well as non-believers.

A similar responsibility pertains to the traditions of Western culture. The Church has been the prime bearer of the cultures of Rome and Greece, enriched in the middle ages and renaissance and still shaping modern society. Integral to that tradition are the liberal arts which have come to us from classical antiquity through the monastic schools and the medieval universities. These arts are essential to the criticism of our culture. All universities benefit when they are authentically taught.

As the bearer and interpreter of Christian Catholic humanism, our Catholic universities offer an integral system of human values against which to criticize contemporary conflicts of technology and values. Our beliefs about man must be taken into account in the design of any future society. How we use medicine, for example, to start, prolong or abort life, to care or cure, to change human nature all depends upon a philosophy of man. We must choose from all the things technology can do those which most clearly fulfill man's rational, social and spiritual being. Those choices are impossible without being grounded in a philosophical conception of man.

Society also needs to see, concretely and realistically, that a system of beliefs does, in fact, modify human relationships and that a system of Christian beliefs leads to Christian behaviour. Catholic universities have an obligation to become communities of faith that examplify Christian and Catholic beliefs. This is a most difficult condition to satisfy because Christ, the model we follow, demands so much love, sacrifice and charity. But to teach charity in the classroom and violate it in our relationships with students, faculty and those with whom we disagree, is to fall into pharisaism of the worst kind. Catholic universities, therefore, can bring two strengths to their dialogue with society and other universities—an unbroken continuity with the tradition of the liberal arts and an integral set of beliefs about man. Both are essential to a reconstruction of the neglected university function of the criticism of culture.

If this is to be done convincingly, Catholic universities must expect to receive and sustain criticism themselves. Out of their exchanges with men and women of learning they, too, will learn. Christianity without true dialogue is a message whose mission is thwarted.

To be truly universities, Catholic universities must recognize more clearly the conditions which define a valid intellectual mission infused by faith. Reason and faith have been, and will often appear to be, in conflict. Each has offended the other in the past. If this is to be avoided, and if Catholic universities wish to be regarded seriously as constructive critics of culture, some distinctions must be made and respected. They must learn to speak with authority and without authoritarianism, of morality without moralizing, of the spirit of the law without idolizing the letter, of licit limits to dissent without repressing new explorations of all truths—scientific, socio-political or theological.

In matters theological Pope John Paul has emphasized that Catholic universities must "safeguard their own character." That character finds "its source and its regulation in Scripture and tradition, in the experienced decisions of the Church handed down by the magisterium throughout the course of the centuries."[14] To safeguard that character we are required to avoid worship of the extremes of those antinomies so beguiling to human minds. All our students and faculty need not and should not be Catholic. That would constrain scholarly excellence, inhibit the internal dialogue upon which our intellectual health so much depends, and frustrate those who want to see us "up close." Our faculties should, however, believe in the validity of our mission. Minds must meet or learning cannot occur; faculty and students must examine meanings and values in the subjects they study. Faculty should express values and exchange their views with each other and with students; students should be encouraged to examine their own. Every question about faith is not a harbinger of heresy. As Thomas Merton said, "The man of faith who has never experienced doubts is not a man of faith."[15]

Some popular academic antinomies must also be eschewed. To place the liberal arts, and especially theology and philosophy, at the center of our uniqueness does not demand a repudiation of professional and technical schools. In a technological society, no error is more damaging to our mission. Doctors, lawyers, engineers and some businessmen influence our lives in the most profound ways. They make value decisions daily for individuals and society. They are the opinion and decision makers of our time and the views they hold shape the kind of society we are.

Not to equip our professionals with the skills for moral decision making or a framework of values is to deepen the conflict between moral and technical authority and expand the "menace of technology" that Pope John Paul II faces. Two decades devoted to teaching the humanities in medical schools allow me some small authority for this statement. Indeed, I submit that integrating the humanities into professional education offers the best chance for renewing the pristine place as teachers of us all.

The same avoidance of antinomies applies to working with the communities in which we reside. When our intellectual resources are those most appropriate to a problem, we should not fear involvement as long as we do so with the stance appropriate to a university—systematically, critically, and with an aim to learning. The unrealistic expectation fostered within and without universities a decade ago must not drive us away from selective participation in meeting society's needs.

Finally, the man of true faith leaves natural reason intact. He does not rush to the barricades every time a speculative suggestion questions old values or opens avenues for thought. St. Cyprian warned us that "Custom without truth is the antiquity of error."[16]

It is a mark of intellectual growth to be able to tell mere custom from truth. The man of faith respects the man whose ideas he may repudiate because he knows that inherent in the love of all learning is the hidden desire for God. That desire shines through all the things about which we can learn, no matter how we learn them. He shares, too, with all who love learning, the hope for a true humanism. Christian humanism offers an integral synthesis that avoids the dangers of all the reductionist humanisms so tantalizingly held before us. Camus, commenting on some of the atrocities of our times, warned us that "the executioners of today as everyone knows are humanists."[17]

Our questions about man can be enriched only when reason informs faith and faith informs reason. Faith and reason complement each other. George Sarton related them this way:

> *Science is the reason, art the joy, and religion the harmony of life.*[18]

The harmony of life does not reside in an idyllic and ataractic existence free of all disquietude. Thomas Merton reminds us that:

> *The concrete situation in which man finds himself as a nature created from a supernatural end makes anguish inevitable.*[19]

Our Catholic universities must assist in the spiritual formation of all their students. The aim of that formation is not the mindless certitude of unexamined beliefs but the growth of the student's mind and heart in a faith which gives meaning to the inevitable anguish of earthly existence.

A decade from now The Catholic University of America will complete its first century. It was founded by the Bishops of America and the Holy See at a time when Catholic universities were few and under-developed, when graduate studies even in the most prestigious universities were in their incipiency, and when graduate education for clerics and religious was infrequent. For 90 years the University has contributed immensely, and often uniquely, to the Church, the nation and the world of scholarship. It has always strived to be a true university, truly Catholic.

Today, Catholic universities are many; their graduate programs are numerous, the clergy may pursue their studies in secular as well as Catholic institutions. Our designation as "The" Catholic University of America must now be earned in a different way. We must continue to pursue the ideal of a true university, truly Catholic with the strictest fidelity. We are still unique in our Pontifical faculties of canon law, philosophy, and theology, in the number of Bishops, diocesan staffs, Catholic university presidents, and church leaders we have educated, in range of our graduate and professional departments, in our national status and our special relationships to the Bishops and the Holy See. But our uniqueness must be even more specifically and broadly expressed; we must become the

model of what it is to be a true university, unapologetically Catholic. In doing so, we must supplement and compliement the similar efforts of our sister Catholic institutions; we must make our resources more widely available and visible to the Church in America.

Fiscal exigencies may detain us, demographic trends discourage us, and the uncertain times complicate our plans. They must never becloud our vision of the ideal we pursue. Ultimately, our survival is justifiable only on the quality of that ideal.

To embolden us may I call to mind the inscription on a small rural church in England which reads as follows:

> *In the year 1653 when all things sacred to the kingdom were either profaned or demolished, this church was built by Sir Richard Shirley whose singular praise it was to do the best thing in the worst of times.*

We cannot wait for the best of times for I believe with Cardinal Newman that:

> *Nothing would be done at all if a man waited until he could do it so well no one could find fault with him.*[20]

These may, or may not be, the worst of times for universities and especially private and church related ones. Yet the best thing can still be done. This is the hope that induced me to undertake the awesome responsibilities of this particular presidency. With the dedication already manifest in this faculty, staff, student body, Alumni and Trustees, we will enter the twenty-first century closer to the ideal of a true university, truly Catholic. If we do so, we will genuinely merit our designation as *THE* Catholic University of America.

REFERENCES

1. John Cogley, "Future of an Illusion," *Commonweal,* Volume 86:11, June 2, 1967, p. 310.
2. Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology,* The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960.
3. Miguel De Unamuno, *Abel Sanchez and Other Stories,* translated by A. Kerrigan, Editor, Gateway Press, Chicago, 1956, p. 17.
4. Alfred North Whitehead, *Modes of Thought,* Capricorn Books, New York 1958, p. 233.
5. Ortega Y Gasset, *Mission of the University,* W.W. Norton, New York, 1966, p. 70.
6. *Ibid,* p. 74.
7. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar," *The Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson,* W J. Black, Inc., 1932.
8. Etienne Gilson, *Reason and Revolution in the Middle Ages,* Scribner, New York, 1954, p. 28.
9. Victor Weiskopf, "Contemporary Frontiers in Physics," *Science,* Vol. 203, January 19, 1979, p. 240.
10. Pope John Paul II, from an address on February 24, 1979 to the members of the Council of the International Federation of Catholic Universities and Rectors of the Catholic Universities of Europe, meeting in Rome, as quoted in *L'Osservatore Romano,* March 5, 1979, p. 6.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Pope John Paul II, *Redemptor Hominis,* March 4, 1979, *L'Osservatore Romano,* Sec. 15, March 19, 1979.
13. Ezra Pound, *The A,B,C of Reading,* New Directions, New York, 1960, p. 85.
14. Pope John Paul II, from an address on February 24, 1979 to the members of the Council of the International Federation of Catholic Universities and Rectors of the Catholic Universities of Europe, meeting in Rome, as quoted in *L'Osservatore Romano,* March 5, 1979, p. 6.
15. Thomas Merton, *Asian Journal,* New Directions, New York, 1975, p. 306.
16. St. Cyprian, *Letters, 1-81,* tr. by Sr. Rose Bernard Donna, *The Fathers of the Church,* Vol. 51, Catholic University Press, Wash., D.C., 1964, Letter 74, p. 292.
17. Albert Camus, *Resistance, Rebellion and Death,* Alfred Knopf, New York, 1961, p. 230.
18. George Sarton, *The Life of Science,* Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1960, p. 28.
19. Thomas Merton, *The New Man,* American Library, New York, 1963, p. 70.
20. John Henry Newman, *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England,* America Press, New York, 1942, pp. 402-403.

Edmund D. Pellegrino, M.D.
President
The Catholic University of America

TOWARD A THEOLOGY OF LEARNING

F. Thomas Trotter*

One may trace the optimism and grandeur of higher education by a form-critical study of the mottoes over college gates. "Let only the eager, reverent, and thoughtful enter here." "Dare great things for God." To the harassed administrator, however, a more fitting motto these days may well be the Dantesque inscription, "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here." It is a grim time indeed, and the rehearsal of the detail of this environment has been stated elsewhere in our hearing and need not be our concern here. The question before us, with increasing urgency, is this: WHAT ARE THE SPECIAL REASONS FOR OUR CHURCHES TO BE INVOLVED IN HIGHER EDUCATION? Has it to do with religious separatism? Not likely anymore. Has it to do with otherworldliness? Not in the communities represented here. Has it to do with confessionalism? Not a problem in most cases. Is the primary reason for our existence simply "institutional momentum?" If this is our reason, then it is no reason at all. As the management of higher education becomes more complicated and even desperate, then the reasons for staying need to be more sure.

Several communions have made serious studies of the role of higher education in the years ahead. One of the more elaborate studies was completed by my own communion. We did a good job in sorting out the survival strategies, providing an adequate and even dramatic data base for decision making, but we did not do a thorough job of stating *with clarity* the special claim we might have to uniqueness in mission. I dare to suggest that our distraction with "survival" has even framed an *ad hoc* missional statement. That implicit statement is too vague and modulated into an "all-purpose" device. Now that we have the data base and a significant breathing space made possible by court decisions on church-state issues, we need to give attention to the mission/purpose issue.

My suggestion is this. We have come to what may be called a "theological" task. That is to say, we are at a place where the historic connections are eroded and dimming in terms of vitality but are still powerful in latent ways in our traditions. The tradition as expressed in the care of the churches of learning is at best quixotic and at worst debilitating. The tradition requires us to promise more than we are equipped to deliver ourselves, and, on the contrary, the denominations are frequently incapable of fully supporting or even understanding the mission of our schools. In the scramble in the recent past for location in the public funding arena, we tended to confuse our constituencies by leaning into a secularity but not, at the same time, using our denominational structures to enlighten our people in the area of public policy. Thus we gave (in many instances) a signal to our primary constituency (the churches) that we, in fact, either did not need them anymore or that education after all *was* a state function in our society.

Educators have been relatively silent on this matter, and the churches have a right to ask why. We have made serious attempts collectively to address the so-called "purpose" question. My own denomination invested a great deal of energy and attention into its National Commission study, but the weakest part of that study *was* the purpose document. I say that without risk because I had a major hand in putting it together. We have an easier time describing the political environment in denomination and state than we do framing our basic purpose. We are quite good at fiscal data gathering and projecting. In fact, that may be what we have learned to do best. But all of these important and helpful instruments lead us to the threshold of the ultimate question: What is the larger purpose of the church-related college?

I am now in my fifth year in my present position. I came from a graduate school where I was dean, and I assumed with jaunty confidence that years in that position qualified me for rich and well-rounded decision-making regarding institutional higher education. But one thing I had not been prepared for. I call this the *"Yahweh Factor."* The

*Presented February 4, 1979, at a joint session of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, and the National Association of Schools and Colleges of The United Methodist Church. Printed here with Mr. Trotter's permission.

Yahweh Factor is that unexpected, unplanned, unreasonable, and unexplainable event that provides new hope, new life, or at least extended life to an institution that has been leaning over the brink for some time. Remarkably few institutions have collapsed in the last five years in terms of the depth of the crisis of funding and students. It may be that the Yahweh Factor is another name for institutional inertia. But I do not think so. Just as Israel came to believe that Yahweh saw to it that its opportunities for faithfulness were extended in surprising ways, so, possibly, in our time we are being given time to state again with clarity what in the world these fragile but tough institutions are doing.

This "theological task" is a vocation for trying to frame our institutional purposes in wider angles, in fact, the widest angles and not more narrow ones. We must think about purpose in ways in which the world generally has forgotten to think, namely, with a sense of ultimacy. We must declare again, being faithful to catholic, reformed, and evangelical traditions, why it is that we care about learning. St. Augustine (*On the Advantage of Believing*) suggested that the wise are not the "gifted and witty," but "those in whom there is, in as far as it can be in man, a knowledge, grasped with surety, both of man and of God, and a life and habits in accord with this knowledge." It is that kind of theological coherence that is the fruit of an educated person. Theology is a science of the study of the structure of first and last things and the purpose of that structure. In this sense, Augustine's definition of "knowledge grasped with surety" and a life lived "in accord with this knowledge" might well be a theological expression of the purposes of many of our institutions.

Now lest we overly indulge ourselves in special self-pity here, let it be stated that all of the humanistic and scientific communities are involved in one form or another of institutional malaise. Speaking to professors in the humanities recently, Ronald S. Berman, former head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, observed, the humanities

> *can no longer provide a coherent picture of man's relationship to the past or image of his role in culture. The physical world's role is increasingly defined and pictured as it influences man, but the reverse is less true. The question always seems to be what can man's environment do for man rather than what does man want for himself and from the world.*[1]

A "theology of learning" assumes the liberation of persons from being helpless victims of disconnected events in the world. A theology of learning will provide a context in which purposeful education and institutional life will be evident and tangible. In short, maybe we are at the time when the family of church-related colleges must unapologetically state a "world-view" and invite persons to enter the community of learners who will say "no" to disconnectedness and careerism and "yes" to wholeness and vocation.

Let me speak confessionally. A year ago I committed myself to a study leave during which I was going to work on this vocational issue. But my leave (as yours have been) was swallowed up Jonah-like by a whale of emergencies and other trivia. That is the experience of most all of us here. We are not given the time to do reflective tasks singularly, much less together. But intellectual work is a community's work, not solitary work. In our world, it must be programmed like everything else. Unless we decide to do this, in some arena and in some collaborative way, it will not be done. There are scholars and researchers by the score writing in the fields of psychology of learning, sociology of learning, methodology of learning, measurement of learning, life-long learning, and even the politics of learning. There is even a popular genre of books on unlearning, non-learning, and de-learning. But where are we, inheritors of the longest lines in the tradition of schools, when it comes to the "theology of learning"?

I am not prepared to provide you with more than a prolegomenon to this problem at this time (at least until I can schedule my leave again). I will, however, sketch briefly a possible model for this work as a way of opening such a conversation.

One may start with the theology of creation and the historic affirmation of the goodness of the world and of God's intention that humankind would life here in peace and love. We cannot go much behind this faith-claim.[2]

The next great act in this drama of the history of faith is the great experiment of humankind in trying to live outside the love and trust that God placed in them. So the garden is replaced by wilderness, love by hate, selflessness by egocentricity, affection by lust, you know the catalog. Israel, the nation surprisingly chosen by God to live in such an intensity of faithfulness that the world would be renewed to its blissful condition, measured the task and lived it. Out of that nation, God drew Jesus the prophet of Nazareth, whose total faithfulness recreated the community of Israel —the new Israel—and announced that the world's history was now irrevocably set on the direction of the reign of God. The church (in all its fragments, let us add) is the strong vessel of that expectation. The giving of one's self to the Lord of the Church, Jesus Christ, is to be admitted to the community of those who are free from all restraint of the fear of knowing (because everything that is is good and is God's), free from the restraint of the fear of meaninglessness (because in faith no possible power can overwhelm one who trusts God), and free to love one's neighbor (because in loving one's neighbor one is showing the sacrifice of thanks for the gift of faith). The church looks forward to the time when *all* things will be made new, when justice will rule in the minds and hearts of all, and when God's rule will be this world's governance.

That is in shorthand the incredible religious world-view that informs us. In the earliest days of the wisdom traditions in Israel, in the Sophistic-Socratic debates in the Hellenistic-New Testament period, and in the medieval and reformation times, this world-view shaped and informed learning. George Hunston Williams of Harvard has noted for us the dazzling way in which the early Puritan devines in our nation drew out the metaphors of theology to design the American university—a virtual paradise in the wilderness of the new world. The campus, the chapel, the library, the colonnade, all reflect elements of this design. The *champs de mars* (campus) is the parade ground for the soldiers of Christ. But by the 19th century, the theological metaphors were being absorbed in other models; the German university with its extraordinary emphasis upon research came to dominate a European and American society already in the thrall of professionalism. Only an occasional retrospective glance like Newman's illuminates the theological landscape.

So we inherit the vestigial tradition, alive in some expressions and mixed in others. But the world-view is alive in articulate and inarticulate ways in our constituencies. In fact, a principal way of reclaiming our churches' attention for learning is to restate our own relationship to that tradition. The essential ingredients of academic life that we may have supposed came from the AAUP or from the liberal democratic tradition or some other source are actually grounded in a theology of learning. What are some of these elements?

1. From faith, freedom.

Because we are free from the fear of knowing, all things are open to us in investigation. There are no secrets, no area of research outside our access. We are in faith free to know, and this is the substantial basis of scientific work.

2. From freedom, charity.

In that freedom, we are free to turn the insights of learning into service of our neighbor. Thus the purpose of the college is bound to the wider good of society and history and the world's care.

3. From charity, hope.

The fruits of this style of learning and knowing are joy, peace, purpose, hope—the things our society seems to crave more than it desires the so-called worldly virtues.

Whitehead once said, "The religious spirit is always in process of being explained away, distorted, buried. Yet, since the travel of mankind toward civilization, it is always there."[1] It is "there" in the church and its institutions; however fragile and dim, the religious spirit breaks out in however fragile and dim, the religious spirit breaks out in startling ways. In Israel, *wisdom* shared with *prophecy* and *law* the responsibility for the nation's spiritual and moral health. Learning, justice, and piety were intertwined (Jeremiah 18:17). Prophet, priest, and wise man (elder) shared the roles of bearers of history, faith, and hope. Our culture recognizes this in the ancient tradition of custom of wearing robes: priest, judge, and teacher—symbolizing community *and* responsibility. Freed as we are from theocratic structures in our society, we are also free fully to live out this religious vocation intentionally. Our church-related schools have a special relationship to this tradition. It lingers on in the area of liberal arts and humanistic studies and a profound care for the quality of the lives of learners. In a recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 29, 1979), Jacob Neusner of Brown writes movingly of this role in teaching.

> *What strikes me about our students, when we first meet them, is how limited is their range of emotions, their expectations of themselves. Having endured and survived the terrible trial of adolescence, they huddle together, bound within their own flat and narrow circle of permissible aspirations of career, not character. It is as if surviving is all that one can ask of humanity. Striking out on one's own is dangerous and demands courage. Imagination is for fools. Anguish, failure, self-doubt are to be dulled. Tears and laughter are permitted only in careful measure about some few things.*
>
> *It is for such as these that Socrates meditates upon the requirements of conscience, that Job speaks of his dead children. For them we tell the story of the Cross and all it stands for, for its part; and the suffering and enduring Israel, the Jewish people, for its part; the blacks and their historic record of toughness and inner power, for theirs; . . . it is the closed ears we want to open, dull eyes we want to educate, confused minds we want to clarify and expand.*

This *quest* or *re-quest* is both internal to our schools and external to our communions. It may be that we are too compromised in the conventional wisdom of the times that our faculties and governors will not be able to manage this quest. The Western Maryland episode was a poignant example of that. But the honoring of and the study of God in the religious tradition of Judaism and Christianity is an essential component to the study of the mind's many interests and disciplines. No apology is needed for that intention. No compromise with academic responsibility or constitutional entanglements is required. The assumption that the role of our colleges was concluded in our society when the state assumed a primary role is patently limited. Isomorphism is another word for flatness and dullness in academia. Without some self conscious effort to ground our work in a living tradition, our schools will contribute to the growing alienation of our society from its intellectual and moral sources.

The *re*-quest is the address to the churches for renewed attention to their own need of learning and their mission to

society. We must restore wisdom to the pastoral and priestly modes of ministry. In the post-Christian era, all claims on human attention are viewed as interchangeable or replaceable or disposable. Even our churches live out their lives in an attitude of *"creeping incrementalism"*—no affirmations have power to move events, no faith claim in our value-systems judges their adequacy, no overarching loyalty aims us to a social life modeled after the intentions of God.

Our growing ecumenical sense of comradeship in this theological task of learning beyond survival is one of our great hopes as a community of schools. Just as we are joined in dogmatic and liturgical conversations as confessions, we need to include a major emphasis on the theology of learning. The National Congress is a first step. But more than that is needed. Learning and faith, college and church, the ecumenical strategies for a world hungry for purpose and hope—these are *our* issues. Too long we have left the field to technicians. Let us get on with our quest and begin to explore how we speak to the world and to our churches about the world, the church, and the college.

FOOTNOTES

1. "The Humanist's Lot: The Search for a New 'Theory of the humanities,'" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (December 5, 1977); 4-5.

2. Augustine, when asked what God was doing before he created the world, wryly suggested that he was making hell for people who asked that question. The long argument among cosmologists and astronomers on a steady-state universe or a temporal theory seems now to be generally moving in the direction of the temporal of "big-bang" theory. A prominent astronomer, Robert Jastrow, recently made a remarkable statement expressing the conditions for a new *theological* seriousness in learning.

> *Now we would like to pursue that inquiry farther back in time, but the barrier to further progress seems insurmountable. It is not a matter of another year, another decade of work, another measurement, or another theory; at this moment it seems as though science will never be able to raise the curtain on the mystery of creation. For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.*
>
> Jastrow, Robert. *God and the Astronomers*, pp. 115-116.

3. Whitehead, Alfred North. *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 221.

F. Thomas Trotter
General Secretary
Board of Higher Education and Ministry
The United Methodist Church

THE UNIVERSITY AND CHANGE IN THE CATHOLIC WORLD

Sargent Shriver*

I come to this podium with a profound and disquieting sense of inadequacy and ignorance. So much needs to be said and said well; so much needs to be done and done well! But those with power often lack knowledge or grace or both, and those with knowledge and grace often lack the courage or means to forsake their sheltered environments to grapple with the pressing, practical problems of ordinary folk. Fortunately, I lack the erudition to arouse the Chicago School of Theology into "Peter Burgerizing" me. Langdon Gilkey, Schubert Ogden, David Tracy have truly drawn and quartered Professor Burger. I can't wait for the next development.

What's worse, however, than being "Peter Burgerized," is being bored. And so I pray, almost abjectly, that these remarks from a mere lawyer will not just bemuse this impressive gathering of theologians, philosophers, sociologists, historians, scientists, and leaders of the laity.

I presume to hope my words will interest you, and even move you to re-evaluate the importance and purpose of your own work. For example, I hope Langdon Gilkey was wrong when he wrote: ". . . A training in theology makes one neither pious nor more discerning nor more wise . . ." If that is literally true, we are all even deeper in trouble than the *Wall Street Journal* thinks.

Enough by way of introduction. Let me proceed to my task—which I have separated into three parts:—

First, I shall describe a few practical problems from my professional and political life and discuss their relevance to the role of academicians and universities.

Secondly, I shall describe and discuss an academic institution in Washington which is attempting to help persons faced with the kind of problems I have faced.

And third, I shall suggest what's missing, and what's needed if universities and academicians are to achieve their maximum effectiveness in helping ordinary people solve some of the practical problems they face.

I hope to do all of this in thirty minutes; so, please fasten your seat belts, and be prepared for a bumpy ride. This is not going to be a polished discourse worthy of an 18th century French salon—or even of Rockefeller Chapel.

I'm a member of the Teddy White generation—"The Making of the President" Teddy White—who in his current best seller, says that after graduating summa cum laude from Harvard in 1938 (I graduated from Yale in '38) he learned (let me underscore that word) he learned that money counted, that guns counted, that power counted, but only when he was sixty years old did he realize that ideas counted. To use his words ". . . The cruelties and nobilities, the creations and the tragedies (of great political leaders) flowed far more from what was in their heads, than from what was in their glands . . ."

This thought came to Teddy White after he was sixty! It took 35 years for a Harvard summa cum laude graduate to figure out that Mao T'se Tung, Charles de Gaulle, Mahatma Ghandi, Winston Churchill, Kennedy and others were motivated more by "What was in their heads than from what was in their glands."

I submit that testimony in a devastating criticism of higher education in America in the 1930's.

The intellectual shallowness of the 1930's education was matched by its capacity to destroy what it could not replace. Again Teddy White provides an example. Teddy White went to Harvard, a devout, orthodox, Jewish youngster and four years later was eating roast pork with the Communists in China. And loving it! Chou-en-Lai was even able to make Teddy White believe that the pork he was eating was duck! How? Because, Teddy White says, Chou-en-Lai was a man you wanted to believe! Now that he is over 60, Teddy White is beginning, apparently, to realize he was wiser at 16. Harvard really helped him, didn't it?

I went to Yale Law School in 1938 naively expecting to study about justice . . . what was right and wrong; what ought to be done to improve society; how to extend the writ of law to overcome the inequities of life. Did I get a shock! The Professors told me the law had little or nothing to do with justice. What the judge ate for breakfast had

*An address given by the Hon. Sargent Shriver at the Rockefeller Chapel, The University of Chicago, Sunday, October 22, 1978. It is printed here with Mr. Shriver's permission.

more to do with his rulings than legal precedents. There were plenty of precedents on either side of any case, they said. "Just give me the conclusion you want and I'll find the precedents," the learned Professor explained to us neophytes. Oliver Wendell Holmes' famous dicta were almost holy writ. Holmes had written concerning the law that there was "no brooding omnipresence in the sky"—no law that transcended the particularities of cases which were to be decided on pragmatic, social mores grounds. As he wrote in the famous Virginia case authorizing the involuntary sterilization of the feeble minded, "three generations of imbeciles are enough." That was evidence enough for him. He didn't want any more "imbeciles"—as he called them. So sterilize them, he said, "in order to prevent our being swamped with incompetence . . ." "It is better for all the world if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. . ." The learned Holmes wrote those lines in 1927, five years before Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World,* in the era which produced Stalin, Hitler, the Gulag and the Holocaust. Holmes was not alone. Harold Laski, another one of the gurus of my time, wrote Holmes congratulating him on the decision, saying ". . . sterilize all the unfit among whom include all the fundamentalists."

Yale and Harvard, Holmes and Laski were not alone in their ethic. We enjoyed, if that's the correct word, lectures by famous law professors and practitioners from Chicago, Columbia, New York, Washington and Boston. And, with this education, we "succeeded!" We won World War II, mastered the world militarily, ushered in the greatest economic prosperity in history, fathered the baby boom, yawned with Eisenhower, and elected Kennedy. And then I chose the "Best and the Brightest." That's what the President-elect told me he wanted. And that's what he got—no political partisanship; no regional or racial narrowness. He got the best businessmen, the best economists, the best diplomats, the best politicians. He even got the first Ph.D. ever to sit in a Presidential Cabinet. They stayed together longer and worked together longer than any Presidential Cabinet in this century. None of them stole money. None of them divorced their wives, or fell into the Tidal Basin or sniffed cocaine, or perjured themselves. All of them got honorary degrees from everywhere. I got 24 myself. But things didn't turn out so well, did they?

I never understood why—till about a year ago—when a young but extremely able political operator told me . . .

"Mr. Shriver, we know everything about politics: how to win elections, how to get out the vote, how to use TV, how to interpret polls, how to choose winning issues, how to package the candidates . . . We've got only one problem"—we don't know what to do with victory."

That, too, is a damning commentary on higher education. Because the man who said that, and his associates, are stars from top American universities.

As Director of the Peace Corps I hired the first Catholic priests and nuns and the first Protestant clergyman ever employed in regular Federal government jobs. Was I violating the constitutional doctrine involving separation of Church and state? No one could tell me. So I went ahead on my own. I was sued, of course, by "Protestants And Other Americans United." But we won.

I authorized the first Federal money for local distribution of contraceptive materials through Community Action Agencies provided the request originated locally and enjoyed local support. "Local Option" we called it. Was that morally right? At the same time I forbade Federal payment for sex information and contraceptive devices to minors without parental consent and abortions no matter for whom. Was that right, morally? No one could tell me.

I had no intellectual training to make those decisions despite seven years of American higher education. My decisions were based on my own reading and beliefs, plus advice from my friends who were as ill-prepared as I.

These Washington activities were preceded by similar experiences here in Chicago. By what right did I, as President of the Board of Education here, discriminate by constructing more new school buildings on the south side in the slum areas near this University than in the well-to-do areas on the near north? By what moral right, incidentally, did the University of Chicago participate in clearing thousands and thousands of poor Blacks from the Woodlawn area to protect the environment around this University? Did the Divinity School faculty members say anything about that University policy and program when it was carried out? Perhaps they did. But Monsignor Egan was the only clergyman I do remember who fought for those Black people then, and for his efforts he was "relieved of his command," and exiled to South Bend.

In the last six years I have visited the Soviet Union frequently on legal business. I've been there probably 20-30 times. I've got good friends who work in the Kremlin. I talk to them on the long distance phone. I drink vodka in the best restaurants there and sleep on clean, cool sheets in their best hotels.

What would Solzhenitsyn say about people like me?

That problem bothered me, so I scheduled a week at the Vatican to ask the experts there for criticism and advice. I had noticed that Gromyko and Podgorny visited the Pope and that Papal emissaries went often to the USSR, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. How could they consort, so to speak, with the atheists, the enemies of God? Should I? I didn't have to—to earn a living.

No one ever suggested that experts in American higher education could help me resolve that personal, moral problem.

And when I ran for President and faced the ultimate contemporary political question—at least in my own mind—would I or would I not "push the button" in a nuclear

confrontation, there was no theologian or moral philosopher who knew enough about nuclear warfare to help me with that problem.

I could add dozens of practical questions and problems from politics, education, warfare, science, medicine, the law, but the point is obvious:

When persons in our society reach a certain level in business, law, medicine, politics, education and other professions, many of the problems they face are moral problems. For the person who becomes President of the United States nearly all the problems are moral problems. Rarely, if ever, does the President lack for military advice, scientific advice, financial advice, medical advice, female advice, Chicano advice, Black advice, or diplomatic advice. He just can't get the advice he needs the most!!

So we decided about ten years ago to see if a new kind of intellectual institution could be created to bring some of the best moral theologians, moral philosophers, social and religious ethicists together on a *permanent basis* with experts from medicine, law, nursing, foreign policy, and science, not just to talk with one another socially, not just for conferences and ad hoc dialogue sessions, but permanently, for joint work. By which I mean writing books and articles together; participating in joint research projects; participating in weekly working seminars together; criticizing one another's scholarly work in utero (so to speak), and teaching courses together. We wanted this institution to be in a university setting—for students, for permanence, for basic research, for scholarly environment, for infiltration or subversion (if you will) of the existing, isolated university schools and departments. We wanted this institution to be located in Washington where its faculty would be readily available to the Federal Executive Branch, to the Congress, to the national press, to the diplomatic corps, and to the headquarters staff personnel of all the churches who center their national work in Washington.

Well, today we've got it—The Kennedy Institute of Ethics. It started slowly, but it's beginning to get results.

How do we measure results? It's not easy, nor a scientific process. But there are at least some signs.

The permanent faculty is large and growing. Scholars do accept invitations to join the Institute. And some even pay to work with us! Faculty members serve on Ethics Advisory Boards to the Secretary of H.E.W., to the Director of N.I.H., to the Technology Assessment Committee of the Congress. The National Commission for Research on Human Subjects now has a "staff philosopher" (which must be a first in American Political History) and that "staff philosopher" is a Kennedy Institute faculty member. (The first incumbent in that post was your colleague, Stephen Toulmin.) Books, articles, and even an Encyclopedia are beginning to appear. New doctorates are being offered; instructional materials rewritten for undergraduate and graduate students; endowment funds developed for professorships, specialized libraries, and computer services; post-doctoral students are being drawn in, new courses offered in law school, in medical school, and for undergraduates; visiting lecturers expand the Institute's influence and outreach. Muslims have joined Jews and Christians and secularists in a cooperative effort to make this Institute an intellectual resource for the entire University. In mundane, technological terms the Institute might be likened to a central heating system or a central power plant from which ethics, moral theology, and philosophy can radiate out to and into every school and department in an entire University; and through that University, to the capital city and Government of our country.

But even this new institution, were it totally successful, would not be able to provide what is ultimately needed for modern man and modern government. For this institution is committed only to the pursuit of knowledge, to the integration of knowledge with ethics and philosophy, and to the application of that unified perspective and those insights to secular problems. The Institute is dedicated to the cognitive disciplines—befitting a University and a community of scholars.

But beyond knowledge lies wisdom, beyond cognition lies volition; beyond truth lies sanctity. How can academic persons and universities contribute to the greatest need of contemporary American society—which suffers not from the absence of food or drink, home or health, nor from lack of physical security, material possessions, freedom of thought, religion, assembly, travel or press.

In a brilliant, recent speech in Washington, Octavio Paz, the Mexican poet, historian and philosopher said:

> *The sickness of the West is moral, rather than social and economic. It is true that our economic problems are serious, and that they have not been resolved; on the contrary, inflation, and unemployment are on the rise. It is also true that poverty has not disappeared, despite our abundance. Huge groups—women, racial, religious and linguistic minorities—still are or feel excluded. But the real, most profound discord lies in the soul of each of us. The future has become the realm of horror, and the present has turned into a desert. The liberal societies spin tirelessly, not forward, but round and round. If they change, they are not transfigured. The hedonism of the West is the other face of its desperation; its nihilism ends in suicide, and in inferior forms of credulity,—such as political fanaticisms and magical chimeras. The empty place left by Christianity in the modern soul is not filled by philosophy, but by the crudest superstitions. Our eroticism is a technique, not an art or a passion!! . . .*

These haunting words so full of truth, so poetic, so wise —stun the mind with their clarity and insight.

What can be done about the world they describe?

I am not sure. Who is? But I have a thought.

I suggest we commence the long, hard task—where scholars are needed as much as saints—of lifting ourselves from "the pursuit of happiness" to an additional and new level of political thought and moral vigour: to "the pursuit of holiness."

So it will take a thousand years for human beings to see "the pursuit of holiness" as a practical, transforming, personal, and societal possibility.

It took as long to reach the high Renaissance after the Fall of Rome. It took the Jews from 70 A.D. till 1967—1,900 years—to regain the Western Wall of The Temple in Jerusalem. Time need not be the most important consideration in "the pursuit of holiness."

What's the relevance, however, of holiness to our contemporary problems? How can its pursuit fill "The empty place left by Christianity in the modern soul"? More important are the substantive questions—What is holiness, and why pursue it? And what has a University to do with that process?

No one could answer those questions, in a few moments, let alone in the conclusion to a mere speech. But in this place speaking to this audience I have the temerity and hope to believe that every person listening to my voice will intuitively understand much of what I am trying to say.

"Holiness" encompasses all those attributes of God's being, and life, and personality, which attract, satisfy, and terrify man. His irresistible power, His immensity and glory; His light, heat, and speed; His overwhelming presence which can fill a million universes and yet touch every molecule in an individual body. We Christians say, as the Jews before us said,—that in eternity we shall find perfect fulfillment in an inexpressible union with God—that we shall join the heavenly chorus in an unceasing chant singing "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty"—Kadosh, Kadosh, Kadosh—Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus.

Does that sound mindless and boring—an unceasing chant of "Holy, Holy, Holy." If it does, probably we don't know what holiness is.

Holiness is that quality which demands our respect, our reverence, our praise, which fills us with joy and awe, which fascinates and charms and fulfills. It is that depth which probing cannot sound, that height which vision cannot reach. But it is also that love, that beauty, which spontaneously elicits the rhapsodic cry—"Holy, Holy, Holy."

Small wonder that Catholics are supposed to address the Pope as "Your Holiness." That's the highest attribute we can conceive of. But how many Catholics, graduates of Universities—know what they are saying when they say, "His Holiness, the Pope." And if graduates of Catholic universities don't know what holiness is, what are Catholic universities teaching them which they cannot learn equally well or better at a secular college?

Rudolph Otto wrote an entire book on "The Idea of the Holy." I am indebted for the insights he has given me. But mustn't philosophers, and theologians today give all that he gave plus a hundred volumes more to teach about and lead modern man to perceive the need for Holiness and for Yahweh. In our scientific, technological, materialistic world will any one or any thing else suffice?

Shouldn't the theologians and moral philosophers teach that holiness is an attitude which includes poetic insight, filial piety, moral vigour and intellectual power—a commitment to explore and explain the holiness of the universe and of mankind—an appreciation of mystery, and of the power of the spirit.

C.S. Lewis described Hell as that state of existence where each person withdraws farther and farther from every other person, indulging more and more in the particular negation which he or she had chosen in preference to union with God. Each one's self-centered existence, each one's loneliness and distance from God, and from fellow human beings, increases and increases and increases —until every such person becomes like a black hole in space where the density of despair equals the distance from God. Infinite destiny, infinite distance, infinite despair. That's Hell! And it can exist on earth, *now*, here, in the U.S.A. as well as in the U.S.S.R.

That's one reason why, it has seemed to me, that Vatican II with its concept of aggornimento was so right in opening the minds and hearts of Christians to the realization that Christians must move outward to save humanity from Hell, not just in Eternity but here on Earth—the Hell which Octavio Paz describes. John XXIII's love enabled him to discern the emptiness and the need of women and men today. Paul VI helped with *Populorum Progresso,* with *Gaudium et Spes,* with his cry "War Never Again! Never again War."

John Paul I communicated his love just with his smile. He seemed to personify the ancient saying—"See the Christians how they love one another!"

Now comes on John Paul II, survivor of a Nazi forced labor camp, trained as a priest in an underground seminary, a 20th century catacomb;—son of a worker and a worker himself in the mines and quarries of Europe; a man who has known hunger, cold and prison; a man despised who has become a man acclaimed. How?

By, I suggest, his "pursuit of holiness."

"True, genuine Christianity," it has been written, "is not a dogma, or hierarchy, or liturgy, or morality, but the life giving spirit of Christ really, though invisibly, present in humanity and acting in it . . ."

That's holiness!

That's what we need!

That's what theologians, philosophers, and moralists are called upon to infuse into the life of the intellect, into the bone marrow of their students, so that they may become the new prophets of the Truth . . . Human beings able to personify the fact that all life, all knowledge, all holiness comes to us by the working of the Holy Spirit whose power exceeds the power of guns, of money, of politics, even the power of ideas.

BACCALAUREATE HOMILY

May 12, 1978

John Tracy Ellis

> *. . . we must be content to hope that we shall be saved—our salvation is not yet in sight—it is something we must wait for with patience. The Spirit too comes to help us in our weakness.*[1]

Tomorrow is the vigil of Pentacost, and during the Mass on that occasion those words will be read. They embody a thought that is not inappropriate to be heard this afternoon by you of the Class of 1978 whose commencement will have awakened a fresh vision of hope as you close this phase of your lives and prepare to open a new chapter of your earthly pilgrimage. For regardless of the numerous and varied patterns that your steps will trace out in the coming time, you will, wherever you are or whatever age you will have reached, have one thing in common: each of you will ultimately arrive at the termination of his or her journey and face the final verdict that awaits us all, namely, either the salvation of which Saint Paul reminded the Romans, or its deprivation. In the meantime the recollection now and then of that inescapable fact will lend moral support and a steadiness of aim to the vocation of your choice, whatever that may be.

May I, then, congratulate you on the successful completion of the high endeavor that originally brought you to this campus, and to congratulate as well your families, friends, and sponsors whose assistance has enabled you to translate the hope and dream of an earlier day into the reality that awaits you tomorrow.

If you have in common with every class that has preceded you, and with every class that will follow you, the certainty of death and final judgment, the society into which you will now step has little in common with that of the University's first graduates of the 1890's or, indeed, with those who received their degrees here as recently as a decade and a half ago. It is a society that is experiencing a profound revolution in every aspect of life, not least in the realm of the spirit, a revolution that has created an unparalleled situation in the United States and in most of the western world. In many respects it resembles that described by a distinguished historian when he wrote:

> *By a revolutionary situation is here meant one in which confidence in the justice or reasonableness of existing authority is undermined; where old loyalties fade, obligations are felt as impositions, law seems arbitrary, and respect for superiors is felt as a form of humiliation . . .*
>
> *No community can flourish if such negative attitudes are widespread or long-lasting. The crisis is a crisis of community itself, political, economic, sociological, personal, psychological, and moral at the same time . . . Something must happen if continuing deterioration is to be avoided; some new kind or basis of community must be formed.*[2]

As members of the Class of 1978 you need no detailed documentation to convince you of the similarity of our society to the analysis offered by the learned historian. Every thoughtful person will agree that the evidence is on all sides of us. Let two current samples suffice to illustrate what is meant. For an almost unprecedented forty-four weeks a work called *Looking Out for Number One* has been on the list of best-sellers in non-fiction. The opening sentences of the introduction and of Chapter I of that work speak for themselves. The author declared:

> *Anyone who is familiar with my philosophy would be disappointed if I didn't say that my sole reason for writing this book was to make as much money as possible . . .*
>
> *Clear your mind, then. Forget foundationless traditions, forget the 'moral' standards others have tried to intimidate you into accepting as 'right' . . .*
>
> *Looking out for Number One is the conscious rational effort to spend as much time as possible doing those things which bring you the*

greatest amount of pleasure and less time to those which cause pain.[3]

The second example presents a far different approach to the malaise of our time in the new book of Sissela Bok, professor of ethics in the Harvard Medical School, which she has entitled, *Lying, Moral Choices in Public and Private Life*. Professor Bok has stated, "no moral choices are more common or more troubling than those which have to do with deception," and after reading her book one reviewer concluded, "lying is epidemic in our society."[4]

The revolution in contemporary society is enormously complicated, and it would be folly to suppose that it could be either explained by any simple cause or remedied by any single formula. Yet virtually all observers are agreed that at its heart lies the malign influence of that deception that begets distrust. It is an influence that has gravely shaken humankind's confidence in international relations, in national government, in business, in education, yes, at times even in the family and the Church. It adds up to the evil harvest that we of the 1970's have reaped from a generation that has lost the high moral purpose in the public domain that was a characteristic of the nation's history, even though there were never lacking Americans whose private lives belied the moral principles that the national ethos honored and extolled. And it hardly need be said that demoralization in the public domain inevitably induces a similar reaction in private lives.

What, you may ask, has this to do with us, members of the Class of 1978? I would answer that by virtue of your training in this University your responsibility to the society of which you are a part has been heightened, and that it may rightly be expected that in your individual place and station you will make a conscious effort to uphold moral principle. Surely, it is not to indulge an excess of elitism or to cultivate intellectual snobbery to state that your time here has raised you above the commonality by reason of your superior education, even though ours is an age when attendance at college or university has embraced the largest numbers in the nation's history. To put it in scriptural terms, our Lord's parable of the talents has a special relevance for you.[5] As Jesus told His disciples in another contact:

> *When a man has a great deal given him, a great deal will be demanded of him; when a man has had a great deal given him on trust, even more will be expected of him.*[6]

Thus you graduates can apply to yourselves Saint Paul's words to the Ephesians when he said, "Each of us has received God's favor in the measure in which Christ bestows it."[7]

Should you, therefore, leave this campus feeling no sense of responsibility in this regard, in a word, with the dominant aim of 'looking out for number one,' either The Catholic University of America will have failed in its obligation to you, or you will have failed the University, your sponsors, and yourselves. For the experience of the race bears steady witness that there is no such thing as a valueless society. If it does not have values of a high and ennobling order it will have those that are demoralizing and base, for on basic issues human motivation admits of relatively little that is simply neutral. To be sure, in many of the lesser choices that men and women are called upon to make, there is a *via media;* but in the essential and significant matters that color and shape a society's conduct and durability the choice is normally more restricted and demanding. Given the talents and the personal enlightenment implied by the degrees you are to receive on the morrow, a neglect of these responsibilities would be a grave omission, one that would almost suggest a sin against the light, that sin against the Holy Spirit of which, you will recall, Jesus once said, ". . . anyone who says a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven; but let anyone speak against the Holy Spirit and he will not be forgiven either in this world or in the next."[8]

But if your university training has enlarged your obligations, so too have your advantages in meeting them been enriched. Unlike many of the classes that have gone before, your outlook on life itself has been rendered more real and enduring by virtue of the more mature and sophisticated concept of your faith. You have been better prepared to meet the complexities that will inevitably confront you, for you have been schooled to understand that there are some questions to which there is no answer. Unlike so many among your predecessors you have been made to realize in the familiar words of Adrian van Kaam that, "Life is a mystery to be lived, not a problem to be solved."[9] In fine, the circumstances in which you have achieved maturity will have convinced you that you must to a degree learn to live with mystery.

Thus your knowledge will inform you that the mystery that enshrouds the Christian dispensation was present at its birth, for you will recall the words of the aged Simeon as he held the Child Jesus in his arms in the Temple of Jerusalem as he said to His Mother:

> *You see this child: He is destined for the fall and for the rising of many in Israel, destined to be a sign that is rejected . . .*[10]

And your acquaintance with the Church's history through nearly twenty centuries will have convinced you of the validity of the divine dichotomy spoken by Simeon before the Church was born at Pentecost. For Jesus has been, indeed, a destiny 'for the fall and for the rising of many,' and for a sign that has since that distant day been rejected by countless men and women who came to know His name.

As a sequel to that initial mystery your faith in the Church has been refined in the sense that, once again unlike the graduates of earlier generations, you do not expect to find in her teaching an answer to all of life's problems, while at the same time you recognize that in the

Church you will discover more answers to human perplexities than in any other source. That is why amid the doubts and uncertainties that engulf us all you and your peers can summon the realistic approach which is a hallmark of your generation, and thus accept with a deeper serenity not only the dicotomy expressed by Simeon but, too, the innumerable contradictions that confront you on every side. With this knowledge and this realism your faith in God and in His Church will be the informing principle of your conscience, and in this way you will be afforded a consolation which no other earthly support can sustain. It will bring to each of you that inner peace that was so marked a characteristic of that blessed and universally honored man, Saint Thomas More, the 500th anniversary of whose birth we celebrate this year. He frequently gave expression to that beautiful and enviable serenity, perhaps never more succinctly than when he wrote:

> *Thou shalt no pleasure comparable find to*
> *th' inward gladness of a virtuous mind.*[11]

Few things are better calculated to destroy the mind's 'inward gladness' of which Thomas More spoke than our generations' pervasive loss of confidence in all that was once thought to afford a haven for the universal yearning for certainty and security. Every element of life that in a previous age seemed to offer that guarantee now appears to have given way, and the human family, seemingly bereft of inspiring leadership, gropes amid the encircling darkness to find a light that will illumine its stumbling steps. Basically it is a condition that had its origins in a stark renewal on the part of all too many of Friedrich Nietzsche's glorification of man and that unhappy philosopher's pathetic cry, "God is dead!" In the swirling frenzy of conflicting forces that subsequently overtook so large a portion of humankind there have been been some Catholics who have turned a deaf ear to the voice of one of our contemporary world's few prophetic leaders, Pope Paul VI, toward whom, I am convinced, in a calmer age history will be kind.

One of the chief substitutes for religious faith that accompanied the unfolding of the modern era was a belief in science. Every civilized person, no matter what his or her religious commitment may be, is appreciative of the marvels achieved by modern science. Moreover, they are grateful that the senseless and enervating war between religion and science has now in good measure been laid to rest. Of late, however, certain scientists themselves have begun to call in question postulates that long held sway concerning such matters as the origin of the universe. The latest work of Arthur Koestler, for example, reveals his disillusionment with the scientific explanation for the universe's beginning.[12] And the appearance of Robert Jastrow of Columbia University before the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science here in Washington three months ago caused something of a sensation, an incident that prompted one reporter to write:

> *In the past few decades this puzzle of the origin of the cosmic egg has bumped astronomers unexpectedly, and a little irritably, straight into the problem of God.*[13]

Even more recently another unsettling voice has been raised when Dr. Arno A. Penzias of the Bell Telephone Laboratories speaking of the origin of the universe stated:

> *My argument is that the best data we have are exactly what I would have predicted, had I had nothing to go on but the five books of Moses, the psalms, the Bible as a whole.*[14]

In that connection one is reminded of that wise scientist, Vannever Bush, long associated with the Carnegie Institution and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who concluded a memorable article which he called "Science Pauses," by carefully weighing the respective positions of the scientist and the theologian, and then envisioning the young man about to embark on a scientific career:

> *As always he will build his own concepts and his own loyalties. He will follow science where it leads, but will not attempt to follow where it cannot lead. And, with a pause, he will admit a faith.*[15]

One has the impression that an increasing number of scientists have begun to pause; if that should prove true, it is a wholesome development, although one that will afford slight consolation to those who rooted their ultimate commitment to life itself and to its values on science alone.

What, then, by way of conclusion is to be said to you, the Class of 1978, concerning the supreme goal of personal salvation of which mention was made at the outset? I am unable to offer you any guaranteed formula by which your success in life can be assured, other than the ancient one that was sounded at the dawn of the Church's life by the first pope. Fresh from the invigorating touch of the fire of Pentecost and imbued with the grace of the Holy Spirit, Saint Peter rose before the hostile Sanhedrin in Jerusalem and boldly declared:

> *This Jesus is 'the stone rejected by you the builders which has become the cornerstone.' There is no salvation in anyone else, for there is no other name in the whole world given to men by which we are to be saved.*[16]

It is by reason of their having been for or against that name that, as Simeon foretold, the intervening centuries have witnessed the rise and the fall of many. It is as true today as it has been throughout Christian history, and it will be thus to the end of time. Endowed with the divine gift of free will, it is for you and for me to make the choice. No one can or will compel us in that most fateful of all decisions. But for those to whom there has been given the

further gift of faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and in the Church as His chosen instrument of salvation for those who believe, the decision should be firmer and more unwavering. And that decision will embrace a consolation which only a commitment to supernatural faith can furnish. In moments of high achievement and joy it will moderate and sober your elation, just as in moments of trial and sorrow it will be your surest comfort and support. For as the history of humankind eloquently attests, there will be moments of both for each of you of the Class of 1978, as there have been for each of us who have preceded you. May success, therefore, attend your every undertaking, but should success elude you, as at times it will, and disappointment, reverse, and grief be your portion, may you have the depth of faith to turn your gaze toward the Cross, for there and there alone will be the vision that can and will sustain you. With that parting thought, then, we ask Almighty God here this early evening that each member of this Class of 1978 may realize in his and her life in the days that lie before you the beautiful prayer of Cardinal Newman when he said:

> *May it be our blessedness, as years go on, to add one grace to another, and advance upward, step by step, neither neglecting the lower after attaining the higher, nor aiming at the higher before attaining the lower. The first grace is faith, the last is love; first comes humiliation, then comes peace; first comes diligence, then comes resignation. May we learn to mature all graces in us;—fearing and trembling, watching and repenting, because Christ is coming; joyful, thankful, and careless of the future because He is come.*[17]

REFERENCES

1. *Romans,* 8: 24-26.
2. Robert R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution, A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959. p. 21.
3. Robert J. Ringer, *Looking Out for Number One.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1977. pp. ix, x, and 1.
4. Alan Lacy's review of Sissela Bok, *Lying. Moral Choices in Public and Private Life.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1978, in *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* XVI (April 17, 1978), 21.
5. *Matthew,* 25:14-30.
6. *Luke,* 12:48.
7. *Ephesians,* 4:7-8.
8. *Matthew,* 12:32.
9. Adrian van Kaam, *Religion and Personality.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964. p. 13.
10. *Luke,* 2:35.
11. E.E. Reynolds (Ed.), *The Heart of Thomas More, Readings for Every Day of the Year.* Springfield, Illinois:Templegate, 1966. p. 57.
12. Arthur Koestler, *Janus. A Summing Up.* New York: Random House, 1978.
13. Philip Hilts, "Lifting the Curtain on the Cosmic Egg and the Big Bang," Washington *Post,* February 16, 1978, p. C1. Jastrow's paper was based in part on his recent book, *Until the Sun Dies.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978.
14. Malcom W. Browne, "Scientists Expect New Clues to Origin of Universe," New York *Times,* Sunday, March 12, 1978, p. 54.
15. Vannevar Bush, "Science Pauses," *Fortune,* LXXI (May, 1965), 172.
16. *Acts,* 4:12.
17. John Henry Newman, "Equanimity," *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1891. V. 71.

John Tracy Ellis
Professional Lecturer in Church History
Catholic University of America

This homily was deljvered at the Baccalaureate Mass at The Catholic University of America, May 12, 1978 and is reprinted with permission from the University's *Administrative Bulletin,* Vol. X, No. 18.

THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE: A QUESTION OF IDENTITY

Xavier G. Colavechio, O. Praem.

For the last two decades, the question of the identity of the Catholic College has been questioned, debated and discussed on campuses and in publications, by academicians and by bishops, in season and out of season. Though many answers have been suggested, none has yet appeared as totally satisfactory. The founding of several new colleges within the last decade with the avowed purpose of placing the philosophy of Aquinas and the teachings of the Church at the center of the curriculum bespeaks the belief of some that existing colleges have somehow moved away, deliberately, under pressure or even unconsciously, from their Catholic heritage. The other end of the spectrum of belief is represented by those colleges which have given up affiliation with the Church and declared themselves non-sectarian.

A great number of Catholic colleges, however, still struggle with the question, apparently dissatisfied with either solution. There is a recognition that times have indeed changed since most of these institutions were founded, but there is also a growing awareness that some of the institutions of our academic ancestors need to be rethought in the light of Vatican II and the demands of the next century. The rethinking process is not an easy one. To establish a think-tank and apply the results is not the way of modern academe. One must involve the whole academic community, especially the faculty, in the process. This approach means there will be no easy solutions next year, for there are fears to be allayed, demons to be laid to rest and basic principles to be agreed on. The faculty must be willing to deal with the question of academic freedom in its best sense and take the time to differentiate between instruction and indoctrination. Dealing with the issue must not be allowed to become an exercise in futility or a tempest in an ivory tower; it must lead to clarifications and affect the curriculum, hiring practices, allocation of resources and the self awareness of the whole college community.

This article uses a small undergraduate Catholic liberal arts college as a typical example of the current state of the question. A direction for dealing with the issue of the identity of the college, specifically as Catholic, is suggested. The college, located in northeast Wisconsin, had struggled with the question of its religious heritage before, and the result was a statement called The Religious Dimension of St. Norbert College. The statement was approved by the faculty and the Trustees as reflecting the general position of the college. This raised the inevitable question: do the faculty and administration really believe the contents of the statement? Is it merely words for public consumption or does it make real demands on all involved? The academic community had to come to grips with the issue. What happened and continues to happen at St. Norbert College can be generalized for many of its sister schools. The direction this one small college has taken may help other colleges struggling with the same issue.

St. Norbert was founded in 1898 as a Catholic institution of higher learning and remains so to the present day. Throughout its history, the College has demonstrated the religious dimension of its existence in a variety of ways, including ownership and control by the Norbertine community, a staff predominantly religious, compulsory chapel, a variety of student rules and regulations, requirements in theology and philosophy, and various and sundry other ways. As the College grew and changed, so did the external manifestations of its religious commitment.

In the late 50's and early 60's, before Vatican II, the number of lay people working at the College increased to the point that they outnumbered the Religious. Lay people were introduced into the Board of Administration; fewer priests lived in the residence halls; theology and philosophy requirements changed and theology became for the first time, a major program. The College still held to its religious commitment even as it attempted to keep up with changing times and demands.

In the mid-60's, Vatican Council II and the Vietnam War brought even more dramatic changes to the contemporary scene and the College was not unaffected by them. A growing awareness of collegiality, the raising of students' consciousness throughout the country, the debate over the war—all these had their effects on the Col-

lege. The decline in religious vocations, the transfer of the Order's theologate to Chicago and the changing image of the priest and his role also have had their effects on the religious dimension of the College, or at least on its perception both internally and externally.

The College Board of Trustees was reconstituted to include a majority of laypeople. There were fewer Norbertines on the staff; those who were, were less recognizable externally, since the religious habit was no longer widely used. There were fewer—and less visible—young seminarians in classes. A layman became president for the first time. The College was erected as a canonical parish, with the active participation of many of the laity. The curriculum was revised, and the requirement was established that all students take 2 courses (equivalent to 8 credits) in either Religious Studies or Philosophy. This latter change was part of a total curricular revision; previously, the requirements were 12 credits in Religious Studies and 9 in Philosophy.

This historical survey is sketchy and somewhat oversimplified and does not do justice to the complexity of the eighty years of growth and change. It is enough, however, to give some perspective to the problem of the identity of the College as Catholic. The question includes many areas for consideration, each of which requires specific attention. The Norbertine community has to grapple with the issue of the Order's relationship to the College; should it control, influence or distance itself from the institution? How visible should priests be in the administration or on campus in general? The College community must decide on problems dealing with the campus ministry and its relation to the mission of the College, the student code, priorities in the allocation of resources, both human and material. The faculty has a particularly sensitive area of concern, the academic manifestations of the religious heritage and mission. It is this area which touches the very nature of an institution of higher learning. There is no such thing as Catholic Chemistry; but is there a difference learning Chemistry at a Catholic college and at one with no religious affiliation? Is a Catholic college one which requires students to add the study of Theology and/or Philosophy to a curriculum or is there a difference in the way the whole curriculum is structured and taught? What is the academic manifestation of a Catholic college's heritage and mission?

The Current Status

One could approach the issue quite simply by referring to the academic requirements in Religious Studies/Philosophy and to those pertinent paragraphs of the College catalogue which deal with the religious dimension of the College. The question might then be formulated: Is this what makes a College Catholic? With the data, one could reply "yes" or "no" and let majority rule. The issue, however, is more complex, especially since the underlying assumptions, perceptions and goals do not appear to be clearly articulated, or commonly understood and held by various segments of the College community.

In April, 1977, one of the staff sociologists at St. Norbert published a study on the College, in which he reports that 14 respondents out of 98 faculty members listed the religious dimension of the College as a strength and 8 listed it as a weakness. The study also included two specific questions on the religious character of the College. One dealt with the implementation of the Catholic dimension of the College. Fifty-one faculty members approved the current direction and 36 disapproved. It is not the statistics, but the reasons given for both positions which are of interest. The majority opinion was based on a continuum of reasons from "reasonable religious program" to "great strides made," with a general feeling reported that emphasis on the religious goals of the College has been rekindled in recent years. The minority, on the other hand, are reported to perceive the institution as a "secular college with a Catholic veneer."

When the specifics of disapproval are reported, we read "curriculum covers a multitude of observations, viz.: 'willy-nilly philosophy/theology requirements . . ., the absence of a consideration of the social doctrine of the Church, . . . low priority to religious and ethical values'."

Forty-two respondents found the current Religious Studies/Philosophy requirements satisfactory for a variety of reasons: enough religion in high school; adding requirements is counterproductive; more would not be marketable; and religious studies is not the most important thing since interpersonal relations, campus ministry and value emphasis in other courses also play a part. Fifty-one respondents reported dissatisfaction with the curricular requirement of 2 courses in Religious Studies and/or Philosophy, preferring "both/and" to either/or; others advocate an indepth sequential approach; still others would alter the content of present courses." Most of those dissatisfied objected to the free system that allows a student to graduate from a Catholic college without examining his religious values. One person comments: "No depth now, only a mish-mash or potpourri of Bach cantatas and Tchaikovsky;" another calls for a course in what the Church is thinking today.

The research report reflects the variety of perceptions, the differing theological understandings and the quantity of alternative suggestions offered, all of which complicate the issue not only at St. Norbert, but in Catholic colleges throughout the country. Some of the suggestions made simply contradict other proposals offered. Some faculty seem to lay the problem at the door of a liberal teaching staff, not the curriculum or the requirements.

The report is not the only indication of the confusion attending the issue. In repeated conversations among faculty, in staff meetings of the Religious Studies/Philosophy teachers, and in divisional meetings, a similar variety of opinions and suggestions are evident. Some would have

value education at St. Norbert limited to the hiring of faculty and staff who would model the Judaeo-Christian heritage but remain "objective" or value neutral in the classroom. Others would be satisfied if a certain Religious Studies course or series of courses was required of every student, and the proposed list seems endless; suggestions include contemporary Catholic doctrine, the social teachings of the encyclicals, peace and justice, business ethics, biological ethical questions, human values, church history, and more. Others seem to believe it is impossible to study theology critically and analytically from a confessional or committed point of view. There appears to be little reflection on the objectives of any requirement in Religious Studies and/or Philosophy and the relation of such a requirement to the goals and mission of the College. It is difficult, if not impossible, so sort out all the data, the assumptions, the theologies, and the perceptions underlying the debate. Perhaps, then, the best way to approach the question is to cut the Gordian Knot and start over.

Our Catholic Heritage and Mission

One might begin a reappraisal with the given fact that St. Norbert College is a religious institution of higher learning, affiliated with the Catholic Church through the Norbertine community, and presume that the College should remain so. Such a fact leads to a need to express that religious dimension of the College's existence specifically in that area which is central to its nature: the academic. In the goals statement, the College community claims that it "proposes to provide for a community rooted in Christian ideals and faithful to the continually evolving Norbertine experience." The statement on the College's religious dimension amplifies this:

> *"The pursuit of wisdom and truth . . . is manifested especially, but not exclusively, in the curriculum . . . The College espouses the philosophy that all human activity is essentially related to human values, and, therefore, it urges that this be reflected in every discipline taught.*
>
> *"More specifically, the College expects its students to grapple with ultimate questions in a formal way. This is done in the several disciplines, . . . but particularly in Religious Studies and Philosophy . . .*
>
> *"The values that emerge from the Gospel and the age-old tradition of Catholic learning should aid in intensifying the meaning of literature, the arts and professional traditions studied by St. Norbert students . . .*
>
> *"In the spirit of the Second Vatican Council, . . . pluralism is demanded by the conscientious pursuit of truth in personal freedom by a diverse group of people."*

In the light of the College's heritage, goals and mission, then, it appears that there are essentially four interrelated issues pertaining to the academic fulfillment of its mission as Catholic. It falls to the faculty, who "has primary responsibility for such areas as curriculum, the matter and methods of instruction," in the words of the College's Policy Statement, to discuss these issues and see that they are properly reflected in the curriculum. These issues are:

1) How do the several disciplines reflect the philosophy that all human activity is essentially related to human values?

2) How do the several disciplines have students grapple with ultimate questions in a formal way?

3) How do Religious Studies and Philosophy particularly have students grapple with these questions?

4) Does the current Religious Studies/Philosophy requirement fulfill our intended goals in the light of our Catholic heritage, and if not, how might the requirement be better stated so that it does?

Issues 1 and 2: The Present Challenge

The Religious Dimension statement urges that every discipline taught reflect the philosophy that all human activity is essentially related to human values. The College, moreover, expects its students to grapple with ultimate questions in the several disciplines. These statements would remain "catalog rhetoric" unless they were taken up by the faculty, internalized and made concrete in the classroom. Currently at St. Norbert College, there is dispute whether these words are mere rhetoric or are incarnated in courses. The issue is a legitimate matter for discussion by the faculty; in fact, it is a duty. The commitment to Christian values that lies at the heart of a Catholic College's reason for being makes it necessary for the faculty to articulate for one another and for the whole community just how that philosophy of value oriented education is understood and implemented academically.

Each discipline within a Catholic College is bound, then, to articulate both for its own staff and for the entire faculty how values orientation enters the classroom and how students in the discipline grapple with ultimate questions. This would provide a context within which the formal study of issues and values in Religious Studies and Philosophy could be seen and the relation of these two disciplines to the entire curriculum could be more readily understood.

Some considerations should be kept in mind during these discussions:

1) given the philosophy of value orientation in the curriculum of a Catholic College, every student should be made aware that there are ultimate issues and human values which touch each discipline and are affected by the approach the discipline takes to instruction;

2) the several disciplines should not be expected to consider these issues and values in the same formal way Religious Studies and Philosophy are expected to;

3) all teachers need not subscribe to Catholic teachings nor even to a Christian understanding of life and its values: ". . . the College considers it essential to its mission and faithful to its tradition to include among its faculty articulate persons for other Christian and even non-Christian traditions. Some faculty, while neither sharing the Catholic tradition nor the Christian faith, remain at St. Norbert because they lead lives of inquiry that support a commitment to the realm of moral values." (The Religious Dimension of the College);

4) the raising of pertinent questions about ultimate issues and human values in the several disciplines would lead to the students' being challenged to articulate their beliefs and values, and should make them highly conscious of the religious heritage of the College, specifically in the intellectual realm;

5) grappling with such questions is not the exclusive preserve of the Religious Studies and/or Philosophy staffs. Each faculty member should contribute to the awareness of the religious heritage in the academic arena;

6) such an orientation does not imply that any student must accept the Catholic Christian position, or that the student must limit his/her intellectual pursuits within the boundaries of Christianity; rather, the students should understand clearly what the issues are, be critically and analytically aware of a Christian approach to them, and "be encouraged to clarify their own values and embrace their beliefs from personal conviction. The campus, like the pluralistic society in which we live, offers a laboratory for the testing and strengthening of human values" (St. Norbert College Goals Statement);

7) not every course offered at the college level presents the possibilities for such an orientation; nevertheless; every area of study (the discipline) considered as an intellectual endeavor, does—or should—include opportunities. Some illustrations might clarify: Are some current business practices in management or advertising consistent with human dignity or freedom? Does the fact that scientific technology gives us the ability to do certain things mean we should? Is the profit motive consistent with Christian principles? What is the relationship between current economic theory and practice and justice? Is the American penal system just? What is the relation between determinism, free will, and the notion of Christian responsibility? Is there more to existence than that which can be physically or scientifically demonstrated? Do Sartre, Kafka, Milton and Shakespeare speak clearly to some of the major problems of the human condition?; do their philosophies reflect or challenge a Christian understanding? Questions about justice, peace, oppression, exploitation of human and natural resources, and human dignity cut across disciplinary lines, as do the issues of human rights, prejudice, beauty, order, good and evil.

The Third Issue: Religious Studies and Philosophy

The Religious Studies and Philosophy disciplines by their very nature have the duty of a more formal inquiry into the issues of human values and of grappling with ultimate questions in a formal way. The two disciplines, however, approach these questions by different roads. Religious Studies uses divine relevation as a source; Philosophy is based on reason alone. In the Catholic tradition, students are expected to confront the ultimate issues and questions about human values from both perspectives. It seems to follow, then, that it would be legitimate to expect any graduate of St. Norbert or any Catholic College to have been faced with the issues and questions from both points of view.

Teachers engaged in these two areas of study should be able to assure their colleagues that the Religious Studies and Philosophy offerings do indeed fulfill this expectation. In analyzing the theology and philosophy curricula, the staff should keep in mind:

1) the requirements of a respectable academic major in each field;

2) the legitimate expectations for service courses for non-majors, seen especially in the light of the College as Catholic in the post Vatican II era and all that implies;

3) the necessity of including offerings at the service course level which would in fact bring students into formal confrontation with the ultimate issues and consideration of the relationship between human activity and human values;

4) the resources available or those which should be available, given the goals and mission of the College;

5) ultimate issues include those which deal with each human being in relationship to himself, neighbor, environment, society, the cosmos and God;

6) a critical and analytical approach to religion can be undertaken either from a phenomenological viewpoint (common in state supported schools) or from a confessional perspective; the confessional perspective does not vitiate the critical and analytical approach, and should not be confused with indoctrination; it is in fact traditional as expressed in the formula "faith seeking understanding";

7) there is a common intellectual attainment or desired understanding that graduates of a Catholic College should have, though this might only be vaguely identified as "a mature confrontation with the Christian heritage," or "the essence of Christianity in its current expression";

8) a "core" course or series of courses may be neither wise nor desirable; any one of a number of approaches could be used to expose the students to the goal and confront them with the issues in question;

9) the confrontation with issues from a religious perspective is different from a consideration undertaken out of pure reason.

The Fourth Issue: The Requirements in Religious Studies and Philosophy

With the data and observations provided by the deliberations on the first three issues, the faculty would then be in a position to make a mature and conscientious judgment about what should be required of students in the areas of Religious Studies and Philosophy. The two disciplines and the service they offer would presumably be seen not in isolation from the rest of the curriculum, or present chiefly because the College is Catholic. Their roles would be, rather, complementary to the entire academic endeavor and, in a sense, central to the unique mission of the College as a Catholic institution of higher learning.

Conclusion

An explicit and articulated commitment to the religious dimension of the College by the faculty of the various disciplines would serve Catholic higher education well. Even though theological pluralism would no doubt be evident, there would be a common basis for understanding, a clearer concept of the goal of Catholic higher education, and a more concrete possibility of students and faculty integrating the knowledge from the various disciplines. An open and candid discussion of these issues would serve to clear the air and contribute to making more explicit the identity of the College as a Catholic institution of higher learning. It might also make the College more readily recognizable as an apostolate of the Church not only by the College staff but by the general public as well.

Xavier G. Colavechio, O. Praem.
Chairman, Division of Humanities and Fine Arts
St. Norbert's College, WI

THE EMERGING GUARDIANSHIP OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

Martin J. Stamm

Until the mid-point of the 1960's decade, the upper echelon governance of American Catholic higher educational institutions was the responsibility of the religious institutes which had founded, staffed, and sponsored those colleges and universities. Members of the laity, both Catholic and non-Catholic, did not substantially participate on the boards of trustees of American Catholic colleges and universities until a convergence of American societal forces and developments, coupled with the revisionary ideals of Vatican II's "aggiornamento," provided the climate within both the Church and the American society to make the inclusion of laypersons possible and welcomed. The process of incorporating laypersons as trustees on the governing boards of these colleges and universities has been advocated by professional associations, Catholic laypersons, Catholic clerical and religious leaders of American higher education, and encouraged by Catholic educational organizations. The discussion of the benefits and liabilities of laicization continues today with the question of appropriateness and productivity of laicization as yet unresolved within the Church and within Catholic higher education.

It was, therefore, the purpose of this study to determine the extent to which the process of "laicization"[2] of boards of trustees at American Catholic colleges and universities had occurred by 1977, and to determine to some degree the impact of that movement. Four focal questions were posed relative to that central purpose: (1) To what extent had Roman Catholic colleges and universities formalized the presence of laypersons on their boards of trustees? (2) To what extent and in what ways did laypersons on those boards participate in the board's total role within the organization? (3) To what extent had the presence of lay trustees on the governing board altered the relationship of the college/university with its founding/sponsoring religious institute (the SRB)?[3] and (4) To what extent had the process of laicization been a national, uniform movement?

This investigation[4] utilized a four-fold methodology: (1) examination of 133 primary source documents—namely, 119 corporate by-laws and 14 institutional charters of American Catholic colleges and universities; (2) data provided by 124 institutional administrators pertaining to board composition, structure, and corporate status; (3) analysis of questionnaire responses from 118 institutional presidents relative to an evaluation of lay performance, contribution, influence, and impact upon institutional governance and mission; and (4) verification of the analysis and interpretation of the data through 42 on-campus interviews with trustees, presidents, and SRB superiors at 14 Catholic colleges and universities across the country. All two-year and technical colleges, liberal arts colleges, and universities which claimed an affiliation with the Roman Catholic Church in 1977 comprised the target population of this study, from which 154 institutional responses were received with 139 institutions providing data for this investigation.[5]

Summary of Findings

Question I: To what extent had Roman Catholic colleges and universities formalized the presence of laypersons on their boards of trustees?

- In general, voting lay trustee presence on Catholic higher educational governing boards was found to be specifically mandated in only a small minority of the by-laws and charters examined in this study, but it was found to be "implied" in over 93% of all institutional governing documents.[6]
- Rarely were members of the laity mandated by the by-laws to hold positions of leadership on the board of trustees or to be delegated leadership posts on board standing and ad hoc committees.
- Seldom were laypersons mandated by by-laws to membership on specific board committees, and rarely was the composition of various board standing and ad hoc committees articulated in the institutional by-laws and charters.
- An examination of institutional by-laws revealed that only 68% of all Catholic higher educational governing boards were COMPREHENSIVE BOARDS—that is, legally promulgated by the by-laws to act as the educa-

tional corporation and to be synonymous with the "corporation";[7] of these boards almost all were INDEPENDENT, but a few were DEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE BOARDS in that they were required by their by-laws to seek approval on certain matters from another corporate entity external to the college/university organization. The remaining 32% of Catholic college and university boards of trustees were NON-COMPREHENSIVE BOARDS, responsible and accountable to another internal organizational group or sole which was equivalent to the "educational corporation."[8]

- In an overwhelming majority of instances, the SRB community had endorsed the concept of laicization of its educational corporation's governing board.

Question II: To what extent and in what ways did laypersons on those boards participate in the board's total role within the organization?

- Lay trustee voting presence on Catholic college and university governing boards was extensive in 1977, with almost 62% of all trustees nationally being laypersons.[9]
- Laypersons were reported on approximately 93% of all institutional governing boards, and their collective presence ranged from 22% to 90% of total board voting membership, with a median presence of 61% of total roster.
- Seventy-three percent of all board chairmen on laicized boards were laypersons.
- Lay trustees were found on 95% of all board executive committees with a median presence of 60% of total voting committee membership.
- Eighty percent of the chairmen of all board standing committees in 1977 were laypersons, with lay trustees comprising over 80% of all committee chairmanships in the areas of investment/endowment, legal affairs, construction/physical plant, development/fund raising, public/community relations, budget/financial affairs, and long-range planning.
- Lay trustee presence on board standing and ad hoc committees was dominant on committees involving the above-mentioned issues along with alumni affairs; in many instances, such lay trustee committee presence was significantly greater than the lay proportion of total board membership.
- Lay trustee presence and participation was found in all areas of the governing board's role within the college/university organization, and institutional presidents almost unanimously expressed satisfaction with lay trustee performance and effectiveness.
- Institutional presidents evaluated their lay trustees as extremely influential in board decision-making in both

Table 1:
LAY TRUSTEE PRESENCE IN RELATION TO 1977 NATIONAL TRUSTEE POPULATION

	BOARDS OF TRUSTEES VOTING MEMBERSHIP			
	BOARDS REPORTING SOME LAY PRESENCE (N = 112)		ALL BOARDS (n = 121)	
STATUS CLASSIFICATION OF BOARD MEMBERS	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total
SRB Board Member[a]	806	34.04%	873	35.82%
Other Catholic religious/clerical board member	52	2.20	54	2.22
Clergy/religious not Catholic board member	5	.21	5	.21
Lay Catholic board member[b]	1112	42.96	1112	45.63
Lay Not Catholic board member[b]	393	16.60	393	16.13
Total Lay Presence	1505	63.56	1505	61.76
TOTAL BOARD MEMBERSHIP (NATIONAL POPULATION) IN 1977	**2368**	**100.00%**	**2437**	**100.00%**

[a]Includes 12 board members from one institution which had been founded by secular clergy of various dioceses; all secular clergy from this institution have been classified as SRB Trustees.

[b]One institution had been founded by laypersons with the assistance and cooperation of the local diocese. In this case, all religious from that diocese are included as SRB board members, while all laypersons have been categorized within the classifications of Catholic Laypersons and Laypersons Not Catholic.

Table 2:
DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGES REPRESENTING LAY TRUSTEE PRESENCE OF TOTAL BOARD VOTING MEMBERSHIP ON ALL LAICIZED BOARDS IN 1977

Percentage Representing Lay Trustee Presence of Total Board Membership	BOARDS OF TRUSTEES (n = 112)		
	Number	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
100			
95-99			
90-94	1	112	100.00
85-89	3	111	99.11
80-84	11	108	96.43
75-79	15	97	86.61
70-74	6	82	73.21
65-69	13	76	67.86
60-64	14	63	56.25
55-59	10	49	43.75
50-54	7	39	34.82
45-49	13	32	28.57
40-44	11	19	16.96
35-39	4	8	7.14
30-34	3	4	3.57
25-29		1	.89
20-24	1	1	.89
15-19			
10-14			
5- 9			
0- 4			

informal and formal settings; this influence was especially noted in board deliberations on issues regarding legal affairs, construction/physical plant, development/fund raising, public/community relations, and relations with the government.

• Institutional presidents regarded lay trustee influence as least evident in decisions regarding the campus ministry program, relations with the SRB community, the institution's academic program, and relations with the local diocese.

• Institutional presidents perceived their own lay trustees as knowledgeable, very dedicated, active and supportive, and extremely effective.

Question III: To what extent had the presence of lay trustees on the governing boards altered the relationship of the college/university to its founding/sponsoring religious institute (the SRB)?

• While SRB members were found as trustees on all governing boards in this study, they were almost always in the minority of board voting presence; nationally, SRB trustees were one-half the number of their lay counterparts, and their median presence was only 35% of the total board voting membership.

• SRB communities had relinquished formal control over the governing boards of 68% of all Catholic higher educational institutions in this study by 1977 (these were the comprehensive governing boards), while they maintained control of the remaining 32% through the establishment of corporate soles, shareholders, and boards of incorporators; this means that they even, in most instances, relinquish their formal authority over the official selection of their own representatives to these governing boards.

• SRB trustees were considered by institutional presidents to be influential in board decision-making only in the areas of the campus ministry program, relations with the SRB community and local diocese, and the theology curriculum—those areas most closely related to the special expertise of the SRB members.

• Cross membership linkages between SRB administrative councils and college/university governing boards were found in nearly all instances, but usually, this cross membership represented a few SRB trustees from one SRB administrative council; SRB leaders were mandated for board membership in only 45% of all by-laws examined in this investigation.

• Almost all Catholic colleges and universities in this study had a distinct, separate organizational budget from that of the SRB communities, and they further salaried their SRB employees equally with their non-SRB employees; these findings intimate an evolving financial and economic independence from the SRB communities. Fewer colleges and universities, however, actually controlled all the educational institution's property and assets, and they oftentimes were dependent upon the SRB community in such matters—either because they did not hold title to the educational properties and assets, or they were bound by the by-laws to obtain SRB approval before any substantial decisions on these matters.

• An overwhelming majority of institutional presidents verified the conclusions of the data that Catholic colleges and universities in 1977 were more distinct, separate organizational and corporate units from the SRB community; lay board presence was credited as a major cause of this evolutionary trend.

• Institutional presidents felt that, while lay board presence had loosened the control of the SRB community over the college/university, SRB influence and power in the college and university's governance was adequate.

• Presidents of Catholic colleges and universities almost unanimously concurred with the notion that their lay trustees were understanding and empathetic of the SRB's past and current role at the institution, and they foresaw laicization as no threat whatsoever to the SRB's continuing involvement and role in the educational activity of the col-

lege/university. Rather, laicization had insured a "shared partnership" in the future of Catholic higher educational institutions.

Question IV: To what extent had the process of laicization been a uniform movement, cutting across the variety of institutions of higher learning, the various geographical regions of the United States, and the varying kinds of governing boards with differing degrees of corporate status?

- Midwestern institutions reported a higher percentage of laicized boards of trustees with generally larger lay trustee voting board presence than institutions in other geographical regions of the country; the East, and especially the West, lagged significantly behind the Midwest and slightly behind the South.
- Universities had a greater percentage of laicized boards which reported greater lay voting presence than other kinds of institutions of higher learning; junior and technical colleges reported the least extensive laicization of their boards and the least pervasive lay trustee presence.
- Institutions with enrollments of 5,000 or more students (FTE)[10] reported the most significant lay trustee presence, as all institutions with enrollments of over 1,000 students had laicized boards of trustees in 1977; the smallest institutions (those with under 500 students) reported below average lay trustee presence and the fewest percentage of laicized governing boards.
- Non-comprehensive boards were found to have slightly greater lay presence than comprehensive boards, and non-owning or partially owning comprehensive boards reported greater lay presence than owning comprehensive boards (which comprised slightly less than one-half of all boards in this study).

Summation of Results

In summary, this study revealed that lay presence and participation were extensive on the governing boards of Catholic colleges and universities in 1977, but the impact of laicization was ameliorated by the non-corporate status of the substantial minority of those institutional boards of trustees. Lay presence had been widely promulgated in both the institutional by-laws (where lay presence was generally implied) and by the formal endorsement by the SRB communities of the laicization of their educational governing boards prior to corporate reorganization to include members of the laity on those boards. Laymen and laywomen were found on an overwhelming majority of these boards, and they were found to be in the board's voting majority on most governing boards. Lay trustees were reported to have been holding a substantial majority of the most influential board leadership positions. They were considered by institutional presidents to be highly influential in board decision-making and policy-making, especially in the areas of board concern in which their business, legal, professional, and management expertise was central to the making of good organizational decisions.

The laicization movement initiated the process which has resulted in making the Catholic educational corporation more independent of the SRB community. While it has lessened the control and influence of the SRB community and its leadership in the formal organizational interrelationships, laicization has not served to sever or jeopardize in any instance the continuation of the SRB's affiliation with and service to the college or university. The laicization movement was found to be more prevalent in the Midwest, at Catholic universities, and at higher educational institutions with the largest enrollments. Non-comprehensive boards tended to have slightly greater lay presence than comprehensive boards, although a sizeable minority of Catholic institutional boards reported laypersons in the majority presence of those governing boards which both act as the educational corporation and also hold title to all educational facilities, properties and assets of the educational corporation.

In conclusion, the results of this investigation indicated that laicization has been an important development in Catholic higher educational governing boards during the period 1963-1977. Involvement by laypersons as trustees was found to be extensive, pervasive, and nationally implemented. Laicization has been a positive movement, and has permitted Catholic colleges and universities to have access to new sources of expertise, finances, and human resources. While formalizing some corporate relations with the SRB, the laicized governing board has not served to dilute the Catholic mission or institutional purpose. Laicization, in fact, offers considerable hope to American Catholic colleges and universities by strengthening their corporate government entities.

REFERENCES

1. This summation of results is drawn from the author's Ph.D. doctoral dissertation study, entitled *New Guardians of American Catholic Higher Education: An Examination of Lay Participation on the Governing Boards of Roman Catholic-Affiliated Colleges and Universities,* submitted to the Graduate Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania. Complete text of the entire investigation is available through University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

2. *Laicization* was defined as "the process of incorporating laypersons into a previously all-religious or all-clerical group of activity." It is *not* to be confused with "secularization" which connotes elimination of or dilution of a religious purpose, mission, or identity.

3. *SRB* stands for "Sponsoring Religious Body," a term which has been commonly adopted by Catholic educators to refer to the founding, affiliated, or related religious institute with whom the college/university has previously or maintains currently historical, corporate and organizational ties.

4. The Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.) provided funds for this dissertation study as part of its Trustee Leadership Program under the auspices of the Lilly Endowment, Inc. The author is particularly appreciative to *Dr. Richard T. Ingram,* Vice-President of the Association, for his continuous support and encouragement throughout this inquiry.

5. The very fine rate of response to the survey questionnaire request for data must be credited to those individuals who graciously acknowledged to their colleagues their support for this research effort. The author wishes to extend special gratitude to *Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy,* Executive Director of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, *Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh,* C.S.C., President of the University of Notre Dame, and *Sr. Jeanne Knoerle,* S.P., President of St. Mary of-the-Woods College, for their endorsement of this study.

Additionally, the following friends and colleagues assisted in reviewing, critiquing, and sharing their wisdom regarding the initial drafts of the survey questionnaire instrument: Dr. William B. Castetter, Professor of Education, University of Pennsylvania; Rev. John E. Brooks, S.J., President of the College of the Holy Cross, Sr. Mary George O'Reilly, S.H..C.J., Trustee of Villanova University and Gwynned Mercy College, Dr. Margaret Healy, Treasurer of Bryn Mawr College, and Dr. James Gallagher, President of Mount Aloysius Junior College.

6. Most often, by-laws specified total board voting membership and minimum SRB representation; less than 4% of all by-law documents examined in this study precisely mentioned laypersons as voting trustees. The number of by-laws which articulated the ratio of religious and lay trustees was incidental. Hence, since in most cases only the extent of religious/clerical or SRB presence on the board was mandated by institutional by-laws, and since most often that presence was less than 100% of the total board membership, the presence of lay trustees was "implied" within the by-laws. This implication was verified through personal conversations and discussions with institutional presidents, trustees, and SRB superiors during the final methodological phase of this investigation.

7. This investigation revealed a variety of governance structures within Catholic colleges and universities. Functionally, it was determined that governing boards could be classified into two primary categories: COMPREHENSIVE or CORPORATE BOARDS, those governing boards which were accorded by charter and by-laws full corporate powers and responsibilities as evaluated in accordance with selected functional criteria, and NON-COMPREHENSIVE or MANAGERIAL BOARDS, those governing boards which were not accorded full corporate power and responsibility as determined by selected functional criteria.

"Comprehensive" or "Corporate Boards" were subdivided into two secondary categories dependent upon their ability to take unilateral action, to exercise corporate authority and responsibility unilaterally. Consequently, "corporate boards" were identified as either: INDEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE BOARDS (since they could take all corporate actions and fulfill all corporate functions unilaterally) or DEPENDENT COMPREHENSIVE BOARDS (which were unable to take *all* designated corporate actions without reliance upon concurrence from some other corporate entity—e.g., SRB General Council, SRB super board—or some other corporation's governing board for certain corporate actions and decisions).

Additionally, for purposes of this study, all "comprehensive boards" were further categorized into two tertiary-level sub-categories: those boards which own the educational assets, property, and facilities of the college/university, and those boards which are non-owning governing boards.

8. Managerial, or "non-comprehensive boards" most often relied upon other internal governing bodies within the college/university corporate structure for full exercise of corporate powers and responsibilities. Managerial boards inherently cannot fulfill corporate functions due to mandated limitations on their power by institutional by-laws. Frequently, the corporate entities under which "managerial boards" operate usually have the following names: board of members, corporate sole, board of incorporators, or board of fellows. In these instances, the board of members is a separate governing board from the board of trustees, while both groups structurally are within the college/university organizational structure.

9. It is interesting to note that laymen and laywomen who are not Catholic comprised nearly 17% of the national trustee population in this study; one of every four lay trustees selected for voting membership on governing boards was not a Roman Catholic. Further, it was learned that non-Catholic trustees held one-fifth of the board chairmanships of the laicized boards in this investigation.

10. *FTE* signified "full-time enrollment and its equivalent."

Martin J. Stamm, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania

INSTITUTIONAL VITALITY: UP AGAINST THE EIGHTIES
A Brief Report on a Conference on Values

James A. Ebben

As the 1980's move toward us, it is becoming increasingly important for administrators and faculty in small, private colleges to stay abreast of the indicators of both institutional vitality and deterioration.

In the current inflationary environment, small, private colleges find that their concerns about money and survival often tend to crowd out the more subtle and sometimes abstract questions of community, opportunity, security, conflict and quality of intellectual life. Yet, these issues are the very dimensions of higher educational organizations which will beg for constant attention and deeper insight over the next decade. The question that should be uppermost in all of our minds is "survival for what?"

Those involved in long-term planning for small colleges are beginning to struggle with the tasks of assessing institutional vitality and detecting the subtle shifts in institutional climate which might affect the quality of performance and the well-being of those within. The real challenge is not only to be able to detect threats to the fragile fabric of vitality, but also to understand what must be done to develop and to maintain the kind of environment conducive to producing, sustaining, and enhancing the creative energies so necessary to any healthy organization.

During the past two-and-one-half years Siena Heights College has experimented with several model activities aimed at the cultivation and maintenance of a climate conducive to the professional and personal development of its faculty and staff. These activities were part of a project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education which was designed to provide approaches that could sustain the quality of the professional and personal lives of all members of the college community even in the time of financial constraints, low mobility, and serious questions about the prospects for the future of private higher education.

The insights provided by this project confirmed an earlier assumption that the question of the well-being of small, private colleges is extremely complex and one that must call upon the collective wisdom, experience and research of those who have expressed a growing concern about the health of these institutions. In view of this conclusion, Siena Heights College arranged for a conference of individuals interested in engaging in dialogue about the issues of institutional vitality and professional development in small colleges. The conference was designed as a forum in which dialogue would occur and where new insights on the issue of institutional vitality could emerge.

About sixty persons responded to the conference invitation. Many answered a preconference questionnaire asking for definitions of "institutional vitality," characteristics of vital institutions, obstacles or constraints posing the greatest threat to institutional vitality, promising ideas to overcome the obstacles, and the names of theorists and practitioners who appear to have the greatest insight into institutional vitality. Their answers provided the framework for task groups to begin outlining some of the key issues and to suggest some agenda for the future. What follows is a brief report on the ideas flowing out of the conference.

Definition of "Institutional Vitality"

Institutional vitality refers to the quality of life, both professional and communal, of an institution. It is a function of individual members' enthusiasm for and identification with the mission and goals of the institution; it also depends on each member's perception that the institution facilitates personal and professional goals, the fiscal viability of the institution, student morale, and external support (in spirit as well as gifts).

A college that has "vitality" is one in which the life signs are all strong. These life signs are: (1) clearly defined and accepted mission; (2) quality academic programs to fulfill mission; (3) a clear sense of direction and obtainable goals; and (4) a climate in which the people who operate the institution are encouraged to be creative, productive, and personally fulfilled.

An institution which has vitality differs from an organization in that values are central to its existence. It differs from a bureaucracy in that individual persons are more important than knowing and adhering to a highly

rationalized, predetermined structure of rules, norms, and procedures. It differs from a group in that continuity over time is a key element. This continuity is traceable to the need to cope with some longstanding human needs rooted in the human condition. It differs from an individual in that there is a shared, communal, cross-person aspect involved.

Vitality—the opposite of lifeless, dead, inanimate—is more than being merely lively. Vitalness (vitality) implies both life or liveliness and strength, force, momentum, challenges being accepted and met.

Characteristics of Vital Institutions

1. Individuals with high energy levels who find problem-solving challenging, not stressful.
2. Individuals who have no preconceived notions about what they can or cannot do—will or will not do.
3. A shared articulated sense of purpose and mission.
4. A curriculum oriented to the students' curiosity and the integration of the students' psychological status and experimental possibilities in the planning of the curriculum.
5. The collective ability to serve the personal and professional needs of the membership (students, faculty and staff) while remaining true to the stated mission.

Obstacles to Vitality

1. A major obstacle (especially for the small college) is the sheer amount of paperwork forced on the college by federal and state governments and the accrediting bodies. This paperwork saps and diverts important energy that should be directed to educationally relevant procedures and processes.
2. Economic struggle (i.e. finding enough students to make the institution viable both educationally and financially) makes it very difficult to engage in the kinds of leisurely, reflective exchanges on the educational process and possibility, coupled with long-term planning needed to nourish individual vitality.
3. The rigid maintenance or only a palliative modification of the traditional curriculum.
4. Public policy: (a) social and economic incentives emphasizing quantitative (e.g. increased student access and equal educational opportunity) rather than attention to quality programs for individual development; (b) competition for scarce public resources between higher education and other national priorities.
5. Inability of the small, private college to compete on fair market terms: (a) the tuition gap between public and independent colleges and universities makes fair competition for students increasingly impossible; (b) competition is further exacerbated by the fact that the pool of traditional college-age students is declining; and (c) the persistence of high economic inflation requires that the small colleges consume meager capital resources faster than these resources can be replaced.

Key Issues

1. One of the key issues is the relationship between money and institutional integrity because we tend not to approach education as a problem of need and ignore the necessity for generating interest. The small college must insure that the actualization of its mission is capable of bringing in monetary support from those who benefit from the institution's pursuit of its mission. A college should be like a good eating place—the good meal creates satisfied customers who, in turn, tell others of this good eating place, who then come, are satisfied, tell others, etc. Education as nourishment for the spirit should create satisfied students—who then tell others, etc. Thus, the money for survival should come from the institution creating and fulfilling a mission that satisfies a basic need in those persons whom the institution desires to serve.
2. Personnel: How do they react under stressful conditions? Can they pace themselves? How do they handle ambiguity? Do they know where their obligations end? How do they react to budget constraints? Are they willing to buy into the mission of the college? Does the institution provide the kind of life-style they want? Does the amount of money they receive satisfy what they believe is necessary for maintaining the kind of life they want? Do they see themselves as professionals? Are they willing to take risks? Why did they go into teaching?
3. "Burnout": While one of the characteristics of a vital institution is individuals with high energy levels who find problem-solving challenging, not stressful, it is important to note that these individuals must pace themselves to avoid exhaustion. Faculty and staff burnout was mentioned frequently by conference participants as a phenomenon at colleges where much energy is spent responding to the needs of new student clientele, making curriculum changes for traditional students, making cost reductions and dealing with fading educational quality.
4. Ineffective Management: Lack of creativity on the part of faculty and administrators. Administrators often focus on quantitative measurements because of financial worries. Faculty are often deeply committed to academic disciplines and cannot justify for themselves interdisciplinary approaches to the teaching/learning process. Hence, decisions are not made in response to the evolving needs of the institution and of the individuals within the institution.

An Agenda for Those Interested in the Vitality Issue

1. Community-building: Discover in the life of the college that setting in which the idea of community can be reinforced.

2. Conflict Resolution: Find ways of quickly identifying personal conflict—a conflict audit—and ways of resolving the conflict before it destroys vitality.

3. Examination of personnel policies to insure that they support the mission(s) of the college.

4. Statement of responsibility for the quality of the work environment and opportunities for personal growth and development. Develop new opportunities for personnel within the institution, e.g. administrative internships for faculty.

5. Promote creative, alternative teaching styles.

6. Mobility: Develop ways of facilitating mobility for those who are ready to leave.

7. Clarification of mission and identifying academic performances which exemplify the mission.

8. Consider opportunities for taking programs away from the campus to where the people are. Look for creative linkages with other organizations.

9. Consciousness Raising: Small private colleges are good places to be for quality education. The university model is not the only standard of excellence.

State and National Policy Issues

1. Effective means of reducing requests for data which are often overlapping.

2. A student aid program that not only allows colleges to compete on an equal basis for students receiving federal assistance, but also compensates for price differences among institutions in a way that enables students to choose colleges on non-economic grounds.

3. Tax credits for personal and corporate contributions to any postsecondary institution.

4. Greater regional coordination of postsecondary education.

5. Federal assistance for private institutions trying innovative approaches to respond more effectively to the educational needs of students.

6. Incentives for cooperation between public and private institutions.

Research Problems

1. What kinds of faculty development activities make a difference in the vitality of an institution?

2. Does an analysis of a professor's own cognitive learning style have an impact on his/her effectiveness as a teacher?

3. What is the quality of faculty's relationship to faculty? (Is there intra-disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary teaching and/or research taking place?) What is the extent of such relationships? What relationships exist between faculty and resource people in the community?

4. How many faculty live the mission of the college? How many identify with the mission? What difference does it make in the vitality of an institution?

5. How does the type of institution (small, private college or large, public institution) affect the quality of faculty relationships?

6. How would you define "burn-out"? Under what conditions does it occur? How do you prevent it? How do you renew yourself? What is the relationship between having control over one's time and "burn-out"? Is it more common among people with many different responsibilities?

7. What leadership style(s) has the greatest impact on institutional vitality?

8. What are the indicators of growth among faculty, staff, administrators, and students? Can the growth of one group have an impact on the growth of the others?

9. What kinds of group experience affect the quality of dialogue among and between faculty and administrators? (Faculty Reading Day, liberal arts seminar, workshops, traveling together to seminars, meeting together with faculty from other institutions, etc.)

10. How much does "vitality" depend on the quality (GPA, ACT scores, SAT scores) of students? What is the relationship between vitality and student improvement based on GPA, SAT scores, ACT scores, etc.?

11. Who cares about whom in a vital institution? Who nurtures whom?

Conclusion

Planning in small, private colleges for the 1980s will have to take account of the concerns raised and discussed at the conference. It is our hope that the insights provided by the conference participants will serve as a means through which interested individuals can engage in dialogue about the issues of institutional vitality and professional development in their institutions. More complete prodeedings from the conference will be published later.

James A. Ebben
Dean of the College and
Director of Professional Development
Siena Heights College
Adrian, MI

THE NEH CHRISTIAN HUMANISM PROJECT AT SAINT JOHN'S, COLLEGEVILLE

R.W. Franklin

Saint John's University is located on 2,800 acres of woodland and lakes seventy miles north of Minneapolis. The university was founded in 1857 and today encompasses 1,800 men undergraduates, 150 graduate students, 160 faculty (40% monastic/60% laymen) and 300 monks attached to the largest Benedictine Abbey in the world. From the 1930's Saint John's was one of the centers of the Liturgical Movement for the English-speaking world. It was one of those institutions which through the Liturgical Movement prepared the way for Vatican II among American Roman Catholics and influenced the social thought, worship, and architecture of American Episcopalians and Lutherans as well. It is ironic that just after the Liturgical Movement triumphed in Vatican II the traditional curriculum at Saint John's, which had integrated this movement's values and those of the Benedictine order into humanities courses, was taken apart. In 1967 the Saint John's faculty initiated a total curriculum revision, eliminating a whole sequence of humanities offerings. Humanities courses were removed from their former centrality in the university. Student interest shifted in the direction of vocational preparation. Humanities graduates declined to 16% in 1977.

Through conversations with other upper midwest colleges it became clear that many religiously-affiliated institutions had experienced a parallel separation between religious tradition, scholarship in the field of religion, and humanities teaching. In many colleges this had become manifest in the specialization and general lack of integration among disciplines. Even though courses in religious studies were being offered on campuses, they were rarely correlated with the humanities.

Saint John's began to work closely with three other institutions: St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota; Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; and the College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota. All four institutions are heirs both of a strong religious and a strong humanist tradition. The four colleges share with one another a long-standing habit of showing a positive interest in cultural values. The schools have all gained a measure of national attention as well—and this in the cultural sphere.

At Saint John's the question of integrating the religious tradition with humanities teaching and the problem of decline in the humanities had been studied by the National Advisory Board and the National Visiting Committee who had made these recommendations by the fall of 1976:

1. That the university pay attention to giving its students a distinctive approach to the world.

2. That the curriculum should be so constructed as to reflect significantly the Benedictine habit of taking long views and emphasizing the merits of diversity.

At a series of meetings held through the fall of 1976 representatives of the four colleges agreed on the following points:

1. That specific humanities curricular changes which grow out of church-relatedness be pursued at each of the four institutions.

2. That specific areas of scholarly investigation be pursued jointly by faculty of the four colleges.

Acting on these resolutions, at the end of 1976 Saint John's applied to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the award of a national consultant to (1) assist the University in designing courses and activities which might integrate religious tradition and humanities teaching more effectively and (2) coordinate planning and implementation of joint courses, activities, and research among the four colleges. A grant of $3,545 was awarded in April 1977. The visits of the consultant, Dr. Edward A. Lindell, President of Gustavus Adolphus College, extended from February 1977 to December 1977, under the core consultancy, and from February to June 1978, under the extended consultancy.

The initial consultancy centered around using a "Religion and Industrialization" concept as a subject theme of core courses that might allow new exploration in the humanities and at the same time build on the Liturgical Movement traditions at St. John's. (The Liturgical Movement had been a Catholic response to industrialization.)

During the course of the consultancy, however, it became obvious that "Religion and Industrialization," given the state of faculty training and interest at Saint John's and the histories of the other three institutions, was an incomplete concept. What was needed was a more encompassing approach which would allow the participation of a greater number of faculty at Saint John's and a high level of cooperation among the four institutions. There was argument from all quarters that the thrust of the four college enterprise should be broader than that which was originally envisioned. An outline curriculum was developed which would allow the history, present role, and future of "Christian Humanism" to be taught as a topical area in the humanities. Thus the consultancy went from "Religion and Industrialization" to "Christian Humanism," from the consideration of a limited number of highly specific courses to an extensive list of classes and activities having four expressions on four campuses, two Roman Catholic and two Lutheran. Finally, there was a realization that further funding should be sought from the National Endowment for the Humanities to assist development of what was now known as the Four College Christian Humanism Project.

Thus, in December, 1977, Saint John's, Saint Olaf, Luther College, and the College of Saint Catherine, each submitted separate Development Grant applications to NEH. However, there were many similarities. The four applications were collectively titled "Humanism in an Age of Limits: A Christian Perspective." Each college made the following arguments to NEH:

1. There has been a growing awareness in recent years that the conventional liberal arts curriculum has failed in one of its major functions: to introduce students to the ideas that are central to our culture. The aim of this proposal is to develop ways of introducing American students to the religious aspects of that culture. These religious aspects have been neglected. To many, Christianity and humanism stand in contrast as rival concepts. The charge is widely heard that religion has been driven out of American education and intellectual life.

2. The humanities will lose if secular humanism becomes the only humanistic tradition in universities and colleges. Christian Humanism is a key to understanding much of the Western culture of the past. If this key is lost, the understanding of that culture will be made more difficult. We prefer to speak of "Humanism from a Christian Perspective." We want to designate a particular religious tradition, one which has been predominant in the Western world. We also wish to include all the phenomena of that tradition (theology, worship, ethics) as they are empirically observable and as they make an impact upon the wider culture. We concentrate on the words Christian Humanism speaks—using Western cultural forms—on behalf of people—essentially the Christian reverence for human kind and its dignity, its positive appreciation of human life, individual and collective. We are interested in its words about the potentialities and limits of human kind, the power of the unique rational faculty as well as the limits imposed by animality, free will as well as the determinism of economics.

3. Given the resources of these four institutions in this tradition of Christian Humanism, we expect real integration to result in the emergence of much higher levels of teaching and scholarship in the study of religion and in general humanities. But we must do this work together. Venturing alone we cannot accomplish these goals. We can exert together more leverage on our own faculties than we can separately. We solve the steady-state faculty problem which faces small colleges by providing constant interchange of faculty and students in our activities. By pooling our faculties and resources we can accomplish teaching, research, publication, and cultural goals which we could never pursue alone. Our courses, studies, and activities are made more objective by combining two Lutheran schools with two Roman Catholic institutions, two co-ed colleges with a men's university and a women's college.

In July 1978 Saint John's, Saint Olaf, Luther and Saint Catherine's were informed that the Four College Project had received grants totalling $250,000 from NEH. Saint John's received $113,000 for a three-year period.

The first courses and activities began in fall semester 1978. The concentration was on the study of Christian Humanism within the broad context of Western history and theology. At Saint John's the focus of activity was on a large upper division history course (approximately 60 students) called simply "Western Civilization." Similar offerings were made available on the other campuses either in theology or history departments. All the students studied a common syllabus divided into great epochs of Christian Humanism (the age of Gothic, the Reformation, the Age of Industrialization, for example) with careful attention to representative individuals (Augustine, Suger, Erasmus, J.S. Bach, Newman, Bonhoeffer). All read an identical list of texts. Lectures and sources from the first course of the project will be published by Augsburg Press in fall 1981. In addition there was an interchange of professors, and students from all four institutions gathered for a day of activities on four fall Saturdays. At Saint John's the theme of this Saturday "Christian Humanism Festival" was medieval and modern monasticism. At Saint Olaf the theme was the Reformation and activities included music, films, lectures, and musical performances centered about that topic.

The same pattern has prevailed in the January Term and spring semester of 1979, except that the January course considered themes of Christian Humanism in modern literature (Dorothy Sayers, Walker Percy, Willa Cather) and the spring course has focused on the specific traditions of each institution. At Saint John's, for example, we have studied the monastic revival of the nineteenth century in

the context of political revolution, the liturgical movement of the twentieth century in the context of industrialization, and the modern movement in architecture and the development of a new Catholic style of church building. At Saint John's we will be offering courses on Christian Humanism in the Freshman Colloquium writing program (Biblical themes in literature) and in our values analysis program (monasticism as a model for secular economic reconstruction).

If class enrollments can be taken as a measure of success, then the 180 students who have been involved in the project since its inception indicate that students are finding value in this approach. The Christian Humanism festivals have brought 240 students from other institutions to Saint John's. Twenty monks of the Abbey and ten professors from Saint Olaf, Luther, and Saint Catherine's have been lecturers or panelists in the project.

Given the large enrollment of the first courses and the excitement generated by the four college exchanges, a circus atmosphere has been avoided through emphasis upon conservative course content and reading lists. The new offerings attempt a renewal of the liberal arts from a particular perspective tied to the past. The use of tradition not only aids in communicating ideas, but it also serves to illustrate a continually evolving component of this university.

But while wishing to recapture some of the strength and vision of the past, there has been no attempt to return to the curricular models of the twenties and thirties. The most obvious departure from older tradition in these Christian Humanism courses is close cooperation with three other institutions, two of them Protestant. The reestablishment of the Christian Humanist tradition today cannot be done by one faculty acting within narrowly confessional boundaries. Links to other churches and colleges must be established. Working alone in a single institution does not have the resources to teach comprehensive, first-rate courses on Christian Humanism from the ecumenical perspective which is demanded today.

The value of the Christian Humanism program to Saint John's at the end of its first year may be summarized in three ways:

(1) As a series of model courses which provide specific guidance for professors throughout the institution in curriculum revision.

(2) As an aid in overall curricular change.

(3) As a vehicle of assistance in institutional soul-searching and redefinition of mission.

R. W. Franklin, Ph.D.
Director of the NEH Christian Humanism Project at Saint John's